DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 995 CS 204 622

AUTHOR	Creswell, Thomas J.
TITLE	Usage in Dictionaries and Dictionaries of Usage.
INSTITUTION	American Dialect Society.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	222p.; Publication numbers 63-64, April-November 1975; Parts may be marginally legible due to small print
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (Stock No. 55774, $7.50 member, $9.80 non-member)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*American English; Comparative Analysis; Dialects; *Dictionaries; Evaluation Criteria; *Language Usage; *Lexicography; Semantics; *Standard Spoken Usage

ABSTRACT

To provide an authority on usage, this book presents an analysis of the treatment of American English as it appears in a number of dictionaries and usage guides. The first chapter presents brief sketches of the usage guides and studies that provided the basis for this compilation and discusses the organization of the book. After a resume of the background and claims of authoritativeness and completeness of the "American Heritage Dictionary" (AHD), the second chapter describes the procedures used in arriving at judgments on usage, discusses the selection of items submitted to a usage panel, analyzes the choice of panel members, and suggests the value of using panel opinions as a guide to usage. Chapter three analyzes the treatment of the same items that were described above as they appear in nine other dictionaries. Each dictionary is described individually and judgments are compared with those expressed in the AHD. The same process is applied to ten usage guides and studies in chapter four. The concluding chapter considers the treatment of all of the locutions as a whole and draws final conclusions as to objectivity, reliability, and authority in the treatment of usage. Seven appendixes and 33 tables are included. (MAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PUBLICATION
OF THE
AMERICAN
DIALECT
SOCIETY

NUMBERS 63-64
APRIL-NOVEMBER
1975

ED167995

USAGE IN DICTIONARIES AND DICTIONARIES OF USAGE

Thomas J. Creswell
Chicago State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas J. Creswell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PUBLISHED FOR
THE SOCIETY BY
UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA PRESS
UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

CS204622

THE AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY

Membership is conferred upon any person interested in the aims and activities of the Society. Dues for regular members (persons and institutions) are $15.00 a year. Members receive free all publications. The price of any one issue when purchased separately will depend upon the production cost of that issue. The *Publication of the American Dialect Society* is issued twice a year, in April and November. It is published by The University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, as is *American Speech*, which members also receive as a Society publication. Correspondence concerning membership should be addressed to the Secretary-Treasurer, H. Rex Wilson, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 3K7.

COPYRIGHT © 1974 BY THOMAS J. CRESWELL

ISBN: 0-8173-0662-5

OFFICERS

President: LEE A. PEDERSON, *Emory University*
Vice-President: H. REX WILSON, *University of Western Ontario*
Secretary-Treasurer: A. HOOD ROBERTS, *Center for Applied Linguistics*
Delegate to the ACLS: FREDERIC G. CASSIDY, *University of Wisconsin*

EDITING COMMITTEE

MARVIN CARMONY, *Indiana State University*
VIRGINIA MCDAVID, *Chicago State University*
MURRAY WANAMAKER, *University of Winnipeg*

VIRGINIA McDAVID, Editor, *Chicago State University*

JAMES B. McMILLAN, Managing Editor, *University of Alabama*

STATEMENT FOR AUTHORS SUBMITTING MSS TO *PADS*

The object of the American Dialect Society, as stated in its constitution, "is the study of the English language in North America, together with other languages influencing it or influenced by it." The Society is therefore interested in publishing in its journal *Publication of the American Dialect Society* (*PADS*) studies by its members in (1) regional dialects, (2) social dialects, (3) occupational vocabulary, (4) place names, (5) usage, (6) non-English dialects, (7) new words, (8) proverbial sayings, and (9) the literary use of dialect. Models for these kinds of studies may be found in earlier issues of *PADS*.

PADS does not publish articles on general grammar without dialect emphasis or articles on literary figures not known as dialect writers.

The general policy of *PADS* is to devote each issue to two or three long articles, or, more commonly, to a single study of monograph length. Shorter articles aimed at a relatively general readership of diverse interests should be submitted to *American Speech*, edited by John Algeo, University of Georgia.

Any MS submitted to *PADS* should be styled by the MLA *Style Sheet* (2d ed., 1970).

PADS does not publish book reviews.

It is the Editor's policy to acknowledge the receipt of MSS promptly, and the policy of the Editing Committee to accept or reject them within six months.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The friendship, guidance, and encouragement of Raven I. McDavid, Jr. have been an unfailing source of support in the completion of this study. His extensive knowledge of language and language study, his devotion to scholarship, his penetrating wit, and his capacity for patient guidance have sustained me during the production of this work.

Gwin J. Kolb's thoughtful, critical reading of the manuscript has helped me to improve both content and style. I have benefited greatly from both his scholarly knowledge of lexicography and his editorial ability.

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to my friend and colleague Virginia Glenn McDavid, who both suggested the original concept and method for this study and helped in numerous ways in the collection and analysis of materials.

CONTENTS

Tables vi

1. Introduction 1

2. Treatment of Usage in *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* 11

3. The Treatment in Other Dictionaries of Usages Voted upon by the *American Heritage Dictionary* Usage Panel 53

4. The Treatment in Usage Books of Usages Voted upon by the *American Heritage Dictionary* Usage Panel 86

5. Conclusion: Consensus, Opinion Versus Use, a Proposal 122

Appendixes

1. Master List 141

2. AHD Usage Panel Members 188

3. Entries Containing Usage Notes in AHD 189

4. AHD Usage Notes in Which Votes are Recorded on More than One Usage Matter or Sample 192

5. AHD Usage Notes with Panel Judgments Classified by Kind of Problem 193

6. AHD Usage Notes with Panel Judgments Involving Two or More Kinds of Problem or Two or More Problems of the Same Kind 196

7. Ranking by Decile of AHD Usage Panel Approval Votes of All Usages on Which a Panel Vote Is Reported: Each Usage and Vote Classified as to Kind of Problem 197

Bibliography 201

Notes 207

TABLES

1. Classification by "Category of Problem" of Usages on Which an AHD Usage Panel Vote is Reported 23
2. AHD Usage Panel Votes on Usages in Speech, in Writing, in Both, and Nonspecific as to Medium 25
3. AHD Use of Restrictive Labels in Entries Containing a Usage Note with a Usage Panel Vote 28
4. AHD Usage Notes in Which the Percentage of Acceptance is Preceded by the Qualifier "Only" 34
5. Distribution by Decile of Votes in Usage Notes in Which the Percentage is Preceded by the Qualifier "Only" 35
6. Distribution by Decile of AHD Usage Panel Votes of Acceptance: Problems Classified as to Category 40
7. Distribution by Decile of AHD Usage Panel Approval Votes on Questioned Usages in the Category *Idiom* 42
8. Distribution by Decile of AHD Usage Panel Approval Votes on Questioned Usages in the Category *Word Formation* 42
9. Distribution by Decile of AHD Usage Panel Approval Votes on Questioned Usages in the Category *Grammar* 44
10. Distribution by Decile of AHD Usage Panel Approval Votes on Questioned Usages in the Category *Diction* 45
11. Summary of Ratings of Usages in Leonard's *Current English Usage* and in *The American Heritage Dictionary* Following the Method Devised by Leonard 47
12. AHD Usage Panel Percentage of Acceptance of Seven Items Rated *Established* by Leonard and Crisp and *Literary English* or *American Literary English* by Marckwardt and Walcott 49
13. Distribution by Decile of AHD Usage Panel Votes on Thirty-two Items Rated *Established* in the Crisp Study 50

14. Words or Senses Labeled *Americanism* in NWD2 on Which an AHD Usage Panel Vote is Reported 67

15. 318 AHD Usage Items Classified as to Treatment in Nine Other Dictionaries 72

16. Usages *Not Treated* by Nine Dictionaries 73

17. Usages *Accepted* by Nine Dictionaries 75

18. Usages Either *Not Treated* or *Accepted* by Nine Dictionaries 76

19. Usages Either *Not Treated* or *Restricted* by Nine Dictionaries 78

20. Usages Either *Accepted* or *Restricted* by Nine Dictionaries 79

21. Treatment by Nine Dictionaries of 318 Usages on Which an AHD Usage Panel Vote is Reported 81

22. Acknowledgement as Usage Problems by Nine Dictionaries of 318 Usages on Which an AHD Usage Panel Vote is Reported 83

23. Number of Items from AHD List *Accepted* and *Restricted* in Ten Usage Books 106

24. 318 AHD Usage Items Classified as to Treatment in Ten Usage Books 107

25. Usages *Not Treated* by Ten Usage Books 109

26. Usages Either *Not Treated* or *Accepted* by Ten Usage Books 110

27. Usages Either *Not Treated* or *Restricted* by Ten Usage Books 112

28. Usages Either *Accepted* or *Restricted* by Ten Usage Books 114

29. Treatment by Ten Usage Books of 318 Usages on Which an AHD Usage Panel Vote is Reported 116

30. 318 AHD Usage Items Classified as to Treatment by Nineteen Dictionaries and Usage Books 124

31. Usages Either *Accepted* or *Restricted* by Nineteen Dictionaries and Usage Books 124

32. Usages Either *Not Treated* or *Accepted* by Nineteen Dictionaries and Usage Books 125

33. Usages Either *Not Treated* or *Restricted* by Nineteen Dictionaries and Usage Books 126

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Although the English-speaking world has never followed Italy and France in establishing an academy to attempt to control, improve, or maintain the purity of the language, the desire for such an authority, an *ex cathedra* arbiter of "correctness," has been expressed again and again. The most vocal, but by no means the only, seekers after authority in language have been writers, belletrists, and academicians, from John Dryden[1] to Jacques Barzun.[2] Dryden was not the first to express a sense of need for linguistic authority, nor, quite clearly, is Barzun the last.

Hardly a month goes by without the appearance in a reputable American publication of a plea for authority in usage. Recently, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reprinted a memorandum sent by the president of Hofstra University to administrators and faculty.

> A three-member committee has submitted, at my request, the following recommendations to govern university policies in matters of grammar, style, and usage:
>
> (1) All heads of academic and administrative departments are to be held responsible for clear and accurate English in all written material emanating from their units. Each supervisor, at every level, is to be held accountable for grammar, style, usage, punctuation, and spelling as well as the content of all written communications.
>
> (2) To facilitate this process, the president will appoint a "university grammarian" to serve on a consulting basis to those supervisors identified in paragraph one. The consultation will be voluntary. It is also recommended that the grammarian be appointed from among those members of the department of English best qualified to fill such a role.
>
> (3) It is further recommended that each member of the secretarial and stenographic staff be provided with the following books.
>
> (a) Margaret Anderson, [*sic*] *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (based on H. W. Fowler).
>
> (b) Theodore Bernstein, *Watch Your Language*, and *Miss Thistlebottom's Hobgoblins: Taboos, Bugbears, and Outmoded Rules of English Usage*.
>
> (c) William Strunk and E. B. White, *The Elements of Style*.
>
> Each unit, area, and department will also be supplied with *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* and *Writer's Guide and Index to English*, by Porter G. Perrin.[3]

It is amusing, and not at all unusual in such circumstances, that the memorandum as printed (1) is in error as to the name of the adapter of Fowler: it is, of course, Margaret Nicholson; (2) specifies the two of Theodore Bernstein's three works on usage which are not appropriate to the designated purpose: the most "useful" for the purpose specified in the memorandum is his *The Careful Writer* discussed in detail later in this study;[4] and (3) designates for use the one modern desk dictionary which carefully avoids making judgments on word usage. Nevertheless, the memorandum exemplifies the belief that authority in matters of usage is to be found in usage guides and dictionaries.

A month later, *Saturday Review World* published Jean Stafford's lament, "Plight of the American Language," calling for "a new kind of [language] censorship."[5] After complaining about euphemisms, neologisms, platitudes, cliches, functional shift, semantic extension, vogue words, and what are termed "mongoloid bastards" (*Vietnamize*) and "knock-kneed metaphors" (*haloed with clout*), the article proposes the establishment of a censorship board to police the use of English, the board to be made up of persons "demonstrably literate, precise, immune to the viruses of jargon and whimsey, and severe. . . ." In short, the article proposes an American academy. Such appeals to authority are seen far less frequently in British publications in recent decades, a manifestation perhaps of a greater sense of social — hence linguistic — security among modern Britons.

Dictionaries have from almost the beginning of the history of English lexicography attempted to respond to this desire for authoritarian — if not authoritative — judgments about language. Samuel Johnson, in his *Dictionary*, placed restrictive labels on or otherwise expressed negative judgments about well over a thousand words or uses of words. His practice differed from that of his lexicographical predecessors only in extent and variety.[6] Johnson had learned in the process of compiling his *Dictionary* the folly of any attempt to hinder language change. In the Preface, he made clear his belief that the opinions of the lexicographer are not likely to impede change.

> Those who have been persuaded to think well of my design, require that it should fix our language, and put a stop to those alterations which time and chance have hitherto been suffered to make in it without opposition. With this consequence I will confess that I flattered myself for a while; but now begin to fear that I have indulged expectation which neither reason nor experience can justify.

His fear notwithstanding, he offered strictures on the use of a large number of words and expressions. James H. Sledd and Gwin J. Kolb conclude that Johnson was far more accurate in his understanding than effective in his practice

> An examination of some eight hundred of his comments in the light of the evidence provided by the *OED* reveals that Johnson's condemnation was no death warrant to these and similar expressions, which went their upward, downward, or level ways despite him; and one must conclude that the extent of his influence on the vocabulary of English, as on English grammar, has been overestimated.[7]

Johnson's failure to prevent the use of expressions he disliked has not prevented his successors, particularly in the United States, from attempting to influence usage. American lexicographers, from Noah Webster to William Morris, editor of *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*,[8] have followed the practice of labeling many words or uses of words to indicate a restriction on their use or appropriateness in some circumstances. A notable exception to this generalization, the practice followed in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*[9] and the abridged dictionaries derived from it, constitutes one aspect of the present study.

A line of development parallel to that of the dictionaries can be seen in other books purporting to be guides to "correctness" in language. From Bishop Robert Lowth's *English Grammar* (1762), through the many editions of the work of his American counterpart Lindley Murray, *English Grammar* (1795), to the scores of college handbooks and trade publications on usage currently in print, the claim of such works to authoritativeness in matters of usage has continued undiminished. The style of statement has changed from dogmatic to descriptive or pseudo-descriptive, the roster of anathematized locutions has changed somewhat, but the basic pattern remains unaltered. Each such work selects a number of locutions and offers a judgment as to their suitability, with the emphasis most often being on their suitability in writing.

In "The Language of the Cultivated," a brief article published in *College English* in 1956,[10] Austin C. Dobbins showed that college handbooks disagree on the appropriateness in student writing of a number of words and expressions. Among the words on which he found some handbooks in disagreement are *ugly* "ill-tempered," *fix* "repair," *complected, feature* "give prominence to," all discussed in some detail, and a longer list, not discussed in detail, *bunch, claim, contact, date, farther, humans, lend, mad, nice,* and *tough.* He found even more obvious confusion and disagreement in the judgments offered by two then widely used dictionaries, *The American College Dictionary*[11] and *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*,[12] on the appropriateness of ten words: *boondoggle, corny, frisk, liquidate, pinhead, bonehead, carpetbagger, pleb, slush fund,* and *snide.* In the ACD, the first five are labeled as slang, and the second five are unlabeled, indicating that they represent established usage. In WNCD, the exact opposite is found: the first five are considered established, and the second five are labeled as slang.

Dobbins' concluding paragraph raises, in broad terms and with reference only to students, the central problem with which the investigation described here is concerned.

> Certain words are deemed inappropriate in college compositions. How is the student to recognize these terms which are inappropriate to the highest level of usage and style – inappropriate to the writing of cultivated people? Perhaps the answer is to advise students to study only one handbook, consult one dictionary, listen to one instructor. An alternate suggestion, of course, is for our textbooks more accurately to base their labels on studies of usage.[13]

Dobbins' small-scale study suggests that a problem exists; it does not offer any estimate of the magnitude of the problem. Is the disagreement confined to a rather small set of locutions? Or does it affect many of the usages dealt with in handbooks? How wide is the variation in assessment? Is it minor, differing only in terminology or in some insignificant ways? Or is it so great as to raise serious doubts as to the usefulness of all the judgments printed in the handbooks? Do the handbooks agree or disagree with the dictionaries; if they disagree, to what extent?

In 1973, in an article entitled "Variations in Dictionary Labeling Practices,"[14] Virginia Glenn McDavid demonstrated that inconsistency in labeling practice among dictionaries is more pervasive and is manifested in more complex ways than Dobbins had suggested. McDavid's study is far broader in scope and more sophisticated in technique than that of Dobbins. She studied the treatment in five modern dictionaries of eighty-eight locutions which are reported upon in two scholarly studies[15] of attitudes toward usage. She found the dictionaries in general agreement, although showing wide variation in detail, with each other and with the more recent of the scholarly studies on roughly half the items, but she discovered great variation in dictionary practices in the selection and treatment of usage problems and in the application of restrictive labels of various kinds. The McDavid study both suggested the scope of the present inquiry and provided some of the basic techniques employed. The basis for selection of items in that study, based on inclusion in both the Leonard and Crisp surveys and upon their being of general interest, did not seem adequate for the broader range study envisioned here. What was needed, it seemed, was a larger number of items selected on a basis promising to be more representative of the areas of concern of those most vocal in their support of the need for authoritarianism in usage. Recent lexicographical events provide such a list of items, ready made.

In 1961, a group of journalists, belletrists, and academicians representative of the forces in American life and letters which most openly and vocally insist upon authoritarianism in usage arose in clamorous concert at the publication of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language*. The furor over the decision by the editors to decrease greatly the application of restrictive labels and eliminate entirely the use of the label *colloquial* has been reported in detail. Raven I. McDavid, Jr., in "*False Scents and Cold Trails:* the Pre-publication Criticism of the Merriam Third,"[16] traced responses to early announcements of the forthcoming work. In a longer, as yet unpublished, paper prepared at the request of Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., now the publishers of W3, he "reviewed the reviews" of the dictionary.[17] An excellent collection of reprints of reviews of W3, both favorable and unfavorable, has been published by James Sledd and Wilma R. Ebbitt in *Dictionaries and That Dictionary*.[18]

As a part of his introductory essay for *Current Trends in Linguistics, Number 10,* Raven McDavid pungently characterizes the response to the publication of W3: ". . . since to the average American a dictionary (especially one the size of Webster 1961) is – like that other best-seller, the Bible –, something to be revered, however little consulted and understood, it was easy for insecure journalists and *belle-lettristes* to establish a hostile climate of opinion long before the work was formally published.

14

It is still anathema among many of the literary gentry; furthermore, its alleged permissiveness has induced timidity or downright backlash among the editors of subsequent competing works."[19] The most avowedly backlash or anti-W3 dictionary is the AHD. Its publishers actually attempted to purchase the Merriam-Webster Company with the avowed purpose of suppressing the dictionary;[20] failing in that effort, the American Heritage Publishing Company designated William Morris to prepare a new dictionary which would restore "responsible" authoritarianism to American lexicography.

When Morris and the other editors of AHD began the task of manifesting their "deep sense of responsibility as custodians of the American language" by adding to their work "the essential element of guidance, that sensible guidance toward grace and precision which intelligent people seek in a dictionary,"[21] they chose a method for doing so which, though not original in a broader sense, was original in application to the development of status judgments in a dictionary. They decided to seek the best advice of those they deemed the best authorities for cultivated usage, "those professional speakers and writers who have demonstrated their sensitiveness to the language and their power to wield it effectively and beautifully."[22] The editors selected a Usage Panel of 105 persons who met their criteria, including, not by accident I believe, a number of those who had been most outspoken in condemning what they regarded as the unbridled permissiveness and abrogation of authority of W3.

To this Panel, the AHD editors submitted for judgment an extensive list of words or expressions deemed of questionable acceptability. Altogether, there are 502 Usage Notes in AHD, but Usage Panel opinion is reported in only 226 of those notes. Almost always, the report of Panel judgment consists of a percentage of the Panel approving or disapproving the locution in question. The note at *anxious* reads, "The example *anxious to see your new car* is unacceptable in writing to 72% of the Usage Panel, but acceptable in speech to 63%."[23]

Because the 226 usage notes in which AHD Usage Panel opinions are reported deal with locutions deemed deserving of question if not condemnation by editors devoted to providing guidance in usage to the modern speaker and writer of American English, and because the judgments or opinions reported are those of individuals who care, perhaps passionately, for elegance and precision in language, the items dealt with in those notes have been selected as suitable for the study of contemporary practice. Those items are used as the basis for the present study of variations in treatment of usage matters and in judgments about individual locutions in a selected list of recent and contemporary American dictionaries, usage guides, and studies of usage. No notes in the list deal with pronunciation, and only two deal with spelling. They are concerned with problems in diction, grammar (both syntax and morphology), word formation, and idiom.

The Master List

The locutions whose treatment is analyzed are presented in the *Master List*, Appendix 1. Figure 1 contains three sample entries from the *Master List*. Each locution is identified by the entry word under which it is discussed in AHD. The "problem" use of each locution is specified as precisely as possible, sometimes by a definition or by an indication of the structure or part of speech use to which an objection is made or implied; most often a brief example or context is provided. Following specification of the questioned use appears the label applied to that usage, if any, by the AHD. Next is a two-letter symbol indicating the classification or category of problem into which the locution has been placed in this study. In the example in Figure 1, the "above" problem is one of *Functional Shift*, the "ain't" problem has been classified as *Grammar*, subclassified as *verb*, and "alibi" is classified as a *Diction* problem, *extension* of meaning. A complete key to these symbols is provided in the "Explanation of Symbols" to the *Master List*.

above (b): as n, "read the —" Fs A44

W2 A	**RD A**	**Kr N**	**Co N**
W3 A	**RC A**	**Le N**	**Be N**
C7 A	**N1 A**	**Ev N**	**Fo R commer**
C8 A	**N2 A**	**Ni R avoid**	**Cr N**
	SC A	**Br A**	**Pe R avoid**

ain't (a): "Ain't I?" NS Gv R99w, R84s

W2 R• di/il	**RD R• ns US**	**Kr R low co**	**Co R uneduc**

W3 R* in/speech	RC R* ns US	Le R D/I	Be R il
C7 R* in/speech	N1 R* co	Ev R	Fo N
C8 R* in/speech	N2 R* co	Ni R il	Cr R N/N
	SC R* ns	Br R ns	Pe R

alibi (a): as n, "any excuse" IN Dx A41w

W2 R co	RD R* US in	Kr R co	Co A
W3 A	RC R US in	Le N	Be R casual
C7 A	N1 R co	Ev N	Fo N
C8 A	N2 R co	Ni R sl	Cr N
	SC R Us in	Br N	Pe N

Fig. 1. – Sample Entries from the *Master List*

At the extreme right of the top line of each entry, the vote of the AHD Usage Panel is recorded, as reported in AHD. An *A* preceding the percentage figure means that the percentage accepting or approving the questioned usage is reported; an *R* means the percentage disapproving or recommending restriction on the usage is reported. A *w* following the percentage figure indicates that the vote refers specifically to the use of the questioned locution in writing only, an *s* that it refers to use in speech only. If no letter appears, the medium of expression is not specified in AHD. In the example *ain't* (a) in Figure 1, 99 percent of the Usage Panel disapprove of or recommend restriction of the usage in writing, 84 percent in speech.

In the columns below each entry, two-character abbreviations identify the nine other dictionaries and the ten usage guides and studies. Immediately following the abbreviation for each work is one letter indicating the response of that work to the locution in question: *N* means *Not Treated* – either the word is not entered at all or, if it is, the specific problem in usage is not referred to; *A* means *Accepted* – in the dictionaries either entered without comment or discussed and approved, in the usage books the latter only; *R* means *Restricted* – either assigned a restrictive label or discussed and recommended to be completely avoided or limited to use in certain contexts.

For dictionaries only, an asterisk (*) following the letter *A* or *R* indicates that the item is discussed in a usage note or synonymy rather than or in addition to being assigned a restrictive label. If a restrictive label is applied, an abbreviation for that label follows. Two-letter abbreviations, lower case and without periods, are used for the standard restrictive labels. In the case of the usage books, because the vocabulary of condemnation or restriction is so varied, one-word characterizations of the "reason" offered for restriction are supplied when appropriate.

In the Leonard and Crisp studies, as items are rated in a different way, pairs of single capital letters separated by a slash indicate evaluations by linguists and by the whole group surveyed. The letters stand for the following: *E–Established, D–Disputable, I–Illiterate* (in Leonard only), *N–Nonstandard* (in Crisp only). Thus E/D means the item was adjudged *Established* by linguists but *Disputable* by the whole group.

This condensation of a large amount of information into a rather tight format aids in the making of rapid comparisons of treatment of each item in the various works studied. Obviously, however, much detail is lost in the process, but it would be impossible to include all that the twenty dictionaries, usage guides, and studies say about all 318 items; to do so would require a volume several times as large as the present one. Fortunately, all of the works but one, the Crisp dissertation, which is available only in microform or reproduction, are widely available and can be consulted by the reader desiring additional information.

In the discussions which follow, locutions are referred to by the key word under which they occur in the *Master List*. When more than one locution is referred to under a single entry word, each is indicated by a letter in parentheses – (a), (b), etc. In Figure 1, "Ain't I?" is elsewhere referred to as *ain't* (a). Another use voted upon under *ain't* is "It ain't likely," referred to as ain't (b).

The Plan of the Study

The discussion of modern practice in the treatment of usage is presented in four parts. In Chapter 2, after a resume of the background and claims of authoritativeness and completeness of the AHD, procedures used in arriving at judgments on usage are described, the selection of items is discussed, the choice of Panel members is analyzed, editorial treatment of Panel opinions is described, and an analysis is made of Panel opinions. Finally, a conclusion is drawn as to the value of those opinions as a guide to usage.

Chapter 3 analyzes treatment in nine other American dictionaries of the items on which AHD Usage Panel votes are reported. Each dictionary is described and characterized individually, and the treatment of each item in each dictionary and in all nine is analyzed, with judgments compared with those expressed in AHD. In Chapter 4, the same process is repeated for ten usage guides and studies.

The concluding chapter analyzes treatment of all the locutions in the entire group of works, taken as a whole, and draws final conclusions as to objectivity, reliability, and authoritativeness in the treatment of usage. After a discussion of the relative efficacy of opinion as compared to studies of actual use of language in the determination of the appropriateness of a given locution to a given context, opinion is found to be a less than satisfactory guide, and a proposal is made for a more reliable method of deriving judgments about usage.

CHAPTER 2

TREATMENT OF USAGE IN *THE AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE*

Pre-publication advertising for *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* heralded it as "the new authority on the English language" and proclaimed that it would be "the first dictionary on the market to provide contemporary guidance on usage." In an article published at the time of its publication, William Morris, the editor, stated that "the executives of *American Heritage*, Houghton Mifflin, and I . . . shared a feeling . . . that *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* had failed both press and public by eliminating virtually all usage labels and other indications of standards of usage. . . . We felt that the dictionary user wants to be given sensible guidance in how to use the language." The AHD, he said, proposed to meet that need.[1]

In the Introduction to the AHD, Morris describes the view of lexicography and sense of editorial duty which inspires the AHD treatment of usage. The editors, he says, "felt a deep sense of responsibility as custodians of the American tradition in language." As an expression of this sense of responsibility, the dictionary "would faithfully record our language, the duty of any lexicographer, but it would not, like so many others in these permissive times, rest there. . . . It would add the essential element of guidance, that sensible guidance toward grace and precision which intelligent people seek in a dictionary."[2]

The Method

A further paragraph in the Introduction outlines the practice followed in the treatment of usage.

> To furnish the guidance which we believe to be an essential responsibility of a good dictionary, we have frequently employed usage-context indicators such as "slang," "nonstandard," or "regional." But going beyond that, we asked a panel of 100 outstanding speakers and writers a wide range of questions about how the language is used today, especially with regard to dubious or controversial locutions. After careful tabulation and analysis of their replies, we have prepared several hundred usage notes to guide readers to

> effectiveness in speech and writing. As a consequence, this Dictionary can claim to be more precisely descriptive, in terms of current usage levels, than any heretofore published – especially in offering the reader the lexical opinions of a large group of highly sophisticated fellow citizens.[3]

The claim made is clear enough. To fulfill their duty, the editors (1) applied restrictive labels (Morris's "usage-context indicators") to some words or senses, and (2) secured the opinions of 100 outstanding speakers and writers on dubious or controversial usages and used those opinions in compiling usage notes. The AHD is, therefore, "more precisely descriptive" of current usage than any dictionary in existence at the time of its publication. One major concern of the present study is the evaluation of the innovative aspect of AHD treatment of usage – the employment of a Usage Panel to determine current usage.

Other dictionary makers have, of course, appealed to authority as a source of judgments about usage, but the AHD is the first to have employed a formal procedure for inquiry and for reporting of opinions, a procedure which is described below. The AHD is not unique in proclaiming that it is usage which determines appropriateness in language and then offering judgments derived from some source other than the observance of language itself. George Campbell, the eighteenth-century Scotch rhetorician, may be said to have perfected the pattern. In his *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776), after dutifully quoting – as was, and is, the fashion – Horace and Quintilian to the effect that usage is the mistress of language, Campbell first defines the "kind" of usage that is mistress – national, reputable, present usage – and then proceeds to establish a set of canons or arbitrary rules of logic or precedence to apply in deciding upon cases of disputed or divided usage.[4]

Morris Bishop, in "Good Usage, Bad Usage, and Usage," the introductory essay on usage in AHD, quotes Horace: "usus, Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi." He supplies a verse translation.

> Yes, words long faded may again revive;
> And words may fade now blooming and alive.
> If USAGE wills it so, to whom belongs
> The rule and government of tongues.[5]

In the tradition perfected by Campbell, Bishop proceeds to indicate that it is not really usage to which we must attend, that is, not how speakers and writers of English actually speak and write, but opinions about usage. "The best authorities, at least for cultivated usage, are those professional speakers and writers who have demonstrated their sensitiveness to the language and their power to wield it effectively and beautifully."[6] What this seems clearly to mean is that the AHD reports, not the practices of those professional speakers and writers, but their opinions. That being the case, it seems appropriate, as a first step toward evaluating the authority and reliability of AHD treatment of usage, to examine briefly the membership of the AHD Usage Panel. Their names are listed in Appendix 2. Most are well-known, established figures in their fields; the AHD provides brief identifying information on each.[7]

The Usage Panel

Actually, there were 105 – not 100 – Usage Panel members. Their characteristics and right to be regarded as authorities on usage have been analyzed by several reviewers and writers on lexicography. Patrick E. Kilburn, one of those reviewers, collected birth dates of the Panel members.

> I have not been able to ascertain the birth dates of all the panel, but 28 were born in the nineteenth century – are 70 or more years old; 32 are in their sixties, 29 are in their fifties, and out of 95 whose ages I have been able to discover, only *six* are under fifty years old!

Kilburn is not impressed. "What," he says, "could such a huddle of arthritic ancients tell about the language of 1970?"[8]

In addition to being on the far side of middle age, to being – to use a term which 53 percent of them find reprehensible – senior citizens, a number of the Panel members share a record of making critical, often scornful, comments about the "permissiveness" of W3.[9] Anthony Wolk, another of those who analyzed the characteristics of the Panel, has pointed out that the average age of the Panel was sixty-four, that it was dominantly male (there were eleven women), that it included seven members of the American Heritage Publishing Company and Houghton Mifflin (joint publishers of AHD), and many editors and columnists from *Harper's*, *Saturday Review*, *Atlantic Monthly*, *The New York Times*, all of which had published articles highly critical of W3's "permissiveness."[10] In short, appearances suggest that the selection of members for the Usage Panel was such as to produce a very conservative set of opinions about usage.

The Choice of Items

To these 105 Usage Panel members were sent at intervals over a four-year period a series of questionnaires on items of usage. The basis for the selection of items to be submitted to the Panel is not entirely clear. Morris, in the Introduction to AHD, says that they were questioned "especially with regard to dubious or controversial locutions."[11] Bruce Bohle, usage editor of AHD, in response to a query from Virginia McDavid on the choice of items, said that the items submitted to the Panel were mainly those about which the editors felt there was significant current disagreement; other items on which usage notes appear were not submitted to the Panel.

> . . . there are notes which make no specific reference to the panel. With very few exceptions, these cover problems not submitted to the panel. We attempted to confine this category [notes on problems not submitted to the panel] to problems on which there is less controversy (though there are times when I wonder whether *any* category is free from much loud disagreement.[12]

What this seems to mean, in the form expressed both by Morris and by Bohle, is that the editors of AHD decided in advance whether an item is controversial. Appendix 3 contains a complete alphabetical listing of the entry words in AHD under which usage notes appear; those entries under which notes including Usage Panel votes appear are starred.

Although what both Morris and Bohle say is clear, it is difficult to see, in comparing those items on which a Panel vote is reported and those on which there is a usage note containing no indication of Panel opinion, just what distinguishes the two sets of items. A Panel vote is reported on uses of *compare* followed by *to* or *with*, but no Panel opinion is reported on the use of *accompanied* with *by* or *with*, nor on *possessed* with *of*, *by*, or *with*, nor on numerous other idioms involving verb- or participle-preposition congruence. It is difficult to see how the problem involving *compare* is more controversial than the others. For almost every category of usage problem on which a

Panel vote is reported, there are examples of usage notes involving the same kind of problem on which a vote is not reported, and presumably was not solicited.

The Panel votes on *gauntlet/gantlet* but not on *callus/callous*. It votes on the use of *media* as a singular, but apparently not on the similar use of *criteria*; even more puzzling, at *phenomenon*, which presents a similar problem for some writers, there is *no* usage note. The Panel votes on the use of *latter* in reference to groups of more than two, but doesn't vote on *former*. It votes on the preterit forms of *dive* and *ring*, but not of *sink*. A comparison of the entries which include a usage note in which a Panel vote is reported with those in which no vote is reported in the usage note suggests that some principle other than relative controversiality was involved in the selection of items to be submitted to the Panel, but the nature of the principle is not apparent.

THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Once items had been selected for Panel judgment, they were submitted to Panel members in questionnaires of the form exemplified by the following.

The following topics pose frequently encountered problems in usage. Please indicate your opinion in each case by checking the appropriate space. We realize that your preferences may not fit readily into a "yes" or "no" category, so we shall welcome your comments in the column provided for that purpose, or at the end of the ballot.

By "would you accept?" in the examples stated here, we mean this: as a writer or speaker, as the case may be, would you use the word or phrase in this sense? As an editor, would you pass it willingly? As a listener, could you hear it without being vexed? By "acceptable in writing" we have in mind the large body of writing between the extremes of conscious formality (of a diplomatic paper, for example) and the deliberate informality and striving for effect characteristic of much fiction (as in dialogue designed to establish character) and humorous nonfiction (such as that which stresses dialect).

In every case, we are primarily interested in determining standards of usage, not in the refinements of style, though obviously the two are related.

FINALIZE. Is *finalize* acceptable to you in general speech and writing, as in "to finalize plans for a class reunion?" (This is distinct from governmental and military usage, where the term is said to have a technical sense.)
Yes........ No........

IMPLY-INFER. The relationship between *imply* and *infer*, according to most modern sources, approximately parallels that between speaker and listener or between writer and reader. To *imply* is primarily to express indirectly, or hint, and thereby to give ground for an inference: "The report implies that we were negligent." To *infer*, in careful usage, is to deduce or surmise: "I infer from the report that you think we were negligent." In earlier usage, *infer* was rather widely employed in the senses listed above for *imply* and *infer* is still sometimes defined, secondarily, as "to imply." Is it acceptable to you in that sense on the basis of the following example? "In your statement you inferred (hinted, said by indirection) that we were to blame." Yes.......... No..........[13]

These two sample items, supplied by Sheridan Baker, himself an AHD Usage Panel member, are fairly typical of questionnaire items, as far as can be determined. AHD has never published, to my knowledge, the complete set of questionnaires submitted to the Panel. Other sources have provided, however, additional samples of questionnaire items. It is instructive to examine the ways in which the usage questions are raised:

The construction *the reason why* is commonly used, though redundant. "The reason why he accepted the nomination is not clear." Would you accept the foregoing example in writing? Yes.......... No..........[14]

Are the following uses of *try* acceptable to you in writing?

A. As a noun: "The speech was a good try at restoring unity in the party." Yes.......... No..........

B. As a verb, the construction *try and* used for *try to*: "It is a mistake to try and force compliance with something so unpopular."
Yes.......... No..........

In written usage is *quote* (noun) acceptable as a substitute for *quotation*: "a favorite quote from the Bible"? Yes.......... No..........
The combining form *-wise* produces adverbs denoting manner of position: *lengthwise, edgewise*. More recently *-wise* has been added to nouns to form adverbs of reference (expressing *with regard to*), such as *dollarwise* and *populationwise*. Thus, "Taxwise it is an attractive arrangement." "The report is not encouraging saleswise." Are the examples of the newer usage acceptable to you? Yes.......... No..........[15]

It seems clear from an examination of these sample questionnaire items that no attempt was made to present the usages being questioned in a way which would invite or at least allow for an impartial, unprompted expression of opinion. The long discussion of the relationship between *infer* and *imply*, the characterization of *the reason why* as redundant, the presentation of *try and* and *quote* as "substitutes" for *try to* and *quotation* – all these seem to have a tendency to invite a negative vote. In fact, 65 percent of the Panel find *the reason why* unacceptable, 79 percent *try and*, and 85 percent *quote*. Whether a smaller number would have expressed negative judgments if the locutions had been presented without negative comment cannot, of course, be told, but it seems probable that the introductory statements would influence opinion negatively.

In addition to the probability that Panel opinion was influenced by the discussion in the questionnaires preceding the presentation of the questioned usages, it seems likely that the contexts or "frames" – the sentences or phrases in which the items are presented as samples of use – are often ill-designed, if the purpose is to solicit open-minded judgment. Albert H. Marckwardt has twice offered the opinion that the frames are impartial and not likely to influence judgment one way or another,[16] but careful analysis of a number of the frames suggests that they are likely to do so. In the examples cited above from the questionnaires, more of the frames deal with politics, bureaucracy, and business than it seems likely would have occurred by accident. Many of the Panel members are on record in disfavor of the language of these areas of activity, and in the AHD, as well as in other dictionaries and usage books, the terms "bureaucratic," "commercial," "political," and the like are almost redundant when used as attributes before "jargon."

Sometimes it seems as though the frame is deliberately designed to urge a judgment that the item under study is awkward: "It is a mistake to try and force compliance with something so unpopular." *Try and* fits less comfortably in juxtaposition to a term like *compliance* than it might in a frame such as "It is a mistake to try and force people to agree with something so unpopular," or "We will try and get it for you." The usage note at *gift* in AHD reads as follows:

> The recent use of *gift* as a transitive verb, though not incorrect, has not established itself on a formal level. The following representative example involving the active voice is termed unacceptable by 94 per cent of the Usage Panel: *He gifted each of his nephews.*

It is not at all clear why such a frame was chosen, unless it was expressly to invite a large negative vote. *Gift* as a transitive verb occurs in a 1608 citation in the OED and is well attested continuously since that date. It occurs, however, in American usage only in contexts in which both the recipient of the gift and the name of the gift itself are mentioned. W3 provides two modern American citations, including one from the *Saturday Review*: "generously gifted us with a copy." In addition, W3 provides several British citations and one Australian. I wonder how the Panel would have voted had they been presented with *gift* in a frame modeled on the one just cited rather than the strained, possibly non-occurring frame cited in the AHD Usage Note. The point of this discussion of frames is that opinions of a locution are easily influenced by matters other than the specific usage under scrutiny, and if truly objective opinions about the usage are to be sought, great care must be taken that accidental, non-critical aspects of the frame in which the usage is presented do not influence opinion.

A favorable effect can also be created by a frame. The sample sentence for *rambunctious* is "Jackson's subordinates did not need whiskey to become rambunctious." Eighty-four percent of the Panel approved that use of *rambunctious* in formal writing. It is interesting to speculate as to how much that opinion was influenced by the association with the rough, free-wheeling style of Andrew Jackson and with the time in history with which the sentence is connected. I wonder if quite as many would have voted acceptance if the sentence had read *Nixon's* instead of *Jackson's*. This is speculation, of course. The essential point is that there is very likely to be a decrease in reliability when the frames in which items are presented are not carefully prepared to minimize the influence of extraneous considerations.

Sometimes the method by which the editors produced the frame sentence is made clear by the Usage Note:

> *Simultaneous* is an adjective only. *Simultaneous with the election was a referendum on daylight saving time.* Its use as an adverb, for *simultaneously*, though common, is not standard. The following paraphrase of the original example was termed unacceptable by all members of the Usage Panel: *The referendum was conducted simultaneous with the general election.*

If this usage is, as the note says, common, I find it surprising that not one of the nine other dictionaries and only one of the ten usage guides or studies consulted in this study lists this use of *simultaneous* as a problem. Interestingly, the one other work which treats this use of *simultaneous* as a problem is *The Careful Writer*, by Theodore M. Bernstein, an AHD Usage Panel member. It is not, to me, surprising that the Usage Panel is unanimous in its non-acceptance of this usage as presented.[17] It seems reasonable to guess that the editors strained the language so much in twisting the "approved" sentence (and I have some misgivings about that one myself) into one which would feature an "adverbial" use of *simultaneous* that they created a possibly non-occurring usage to which all members of the Panel responded negatively precisely because it was non-occurring or non-English.

In querying the Panel on the use of *errata* as a singular, the editors provided the frame: "The errata is/are noted in the appendix." Ninety-one percent of the Panel chose *are*. I wonder whether the vote might not have been different if the frame had been "The errata is in the appendix." Such a frame would make it possible to construe *errata* as "list of errors," the sense in which it is often followed by a singular verb. To make again the point for which this series of frames has been presented, the choice and construction of frame can have a very strong influence on Panel reaction. To what extent the choices we have discussed were purposeful – that is, designed to influence opinion, as opposed to merely being careless – is a subject only for surmise. Suffice it to say that thoughtful consideration of the frames often suggests that the judges' opinions could have been – and in all likelihood were – influenced to some extent by the frames in which the questioned usages were presented.

Much of the preceding discussion of AHD has really dealt with the question of the line between editorial opinion and Panel opinion. Although the idea of using a panel of experts to evaluate questioned items of usage has surface appeal, at least to some, clearly the use of such a panel cannot produce a reliable guide to usage – one more valuable than other guides – if the selection of the panel, the choice of items to be evaluated, and the format for presentation of those items are all of questionable objectivity and fairness. An aged, if not superannuated, panel, largely committed in advance to a strong authoritarian bias, dealing with a set of items selected on a basis not clear to the user of AHD, the items presented in a format and in frames which sometimes seem to invite negative or, randomly, positive reaction – such a combination can hardly produce a dictionary "more precisely descriptive, in terms of current usage levels, than any heretofore published."

THE AHD USAGE NOTES

Having described the method employed by the editors of AHD in collecting opinions on matters of usage, we can now turn to an examination of the product of that method – the AHD usage notes themselves. Since a specific purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness of the use of a panel of experts in the formulation of guidance on usage, we will analyze in detail *only* those AHD usage notes in which a vote by the Usage Panel is reported. The relative number of such notes in AHD is a matter of interest and, perhaps, of significance.

When AHD was published in 1969, it contained 501 usage notes; one of the notes, that appearing at the entry *negative*, was a verbatim repetition of the note appearing at the entry *double negative*, so the actual total of different usage notes was a round 500. Of these 500 notes, 225, or slightly less than half, included reference to a vote by the Usage Panel. The 1971 edition of AHD, the edition used in this study, contains 502 different notes, including 226 which report Panel votes. The most recent (1973) edition of AHD contains 506 notes, including 230 reporting Panel votes. Appendix 3 contains a complete alphabetical listing of the entries in AHD under which usage notes appear. Entries with notes containing reports of Panel votes are starred. As the figures above indicate, there is not much change from edition to edition in number of notes. Spot-checking indicates that editorial change in the body of the notes is non-existent. No change in the content of notes was found.[18]

One of the curiosities revealed by these figures is that it appears that the editors did not report all of the Panel opinions they collected. Whether the opinions were used without being overtly reported is not clear. William Morris, editor of AHD, said that "over a four-year period we sent more than 600 questions about linguistic problems, debatable usages" to the Panel members. He also reported that, on the basis of Panel replies to queries, the editors prepared "some 600 Usage Notes."[19] Only 500 of those notes appeared in the first edition of AHD, and at the rate so far adopted for the addition of new notes (the 1973 edition contains 506), no man now living is likely to see the remainder of the prepared notes in print.

The evidence regarding items on which Usage Panel votes were available but were suppressed presents intriguing questions. Morris Bishop in the introductory essay on usage in AHD, reports, for instance, that 95 percent of the Panel find unacceptable the use of *their own* to refer to a singular antecedent as in "nobody thinks the criticism applies to their own work."[20] Two of the usage notes in AHD refer to this usage directly, the notes at *everyone* and at *no one*, but in neither of these notes is the Panel vote reported. Bishop also reports that 96 percent approve the use of *slow* as an adverb,[21] as in "Drive slow," but no vote is reported in the note at *slow*.

Marckwardt, with no indication of the source of his information, says that the omitted relative construction is considered permissible by "a slight majority" of the Usage Panel.[22] No usage note that I have been able to find in AHD reports a Usage Panel vote on an omitted relative construction. How many more of the usage notes in AHD deal with matters upon which a Panel vote was collected but do not report the results of that vote cannot be determined without access to complete questionnaire results. These three examples, however, suggest that there may be more, and this evidence that the editors used some "discretion" in reporting or not reporting Panel votes implies that some editorial principle – or at worst some editorial whim – was applied in making decisions about reporting Panel votes.

The difference between the number of "questions about linguistic problems" (600) and the number of reports of the results of those questions is not quite so great as is suggested by the total presented above of the number of notes in which Usage Panel votes appear (226). In the 226 usage notes which include a Usage Panel vote in the 1971 edition of AHD, there are actually 318 specific usages or samples of usage for which a Panel vote is reported. All told, 65 of the 226 notes include votes on more than one usage; 157 votes are reported in these 65 notes. The entry *ain't*, for example, includes reports of votes on "Ain't I?" "It ain't likely," and "Aren't I?" Appendix 4 lists the entry words under which notes with more than one vote appear, indicating the number of usages voted on in each entry. The notes at *can, noun, OK, quite, split infinitive, very,* and *were* contain four votes each. Others have votes on either three or two usages.

The remainder of the notes (161) contain a vote on one usage or example only. Even this figure (318) leaves unreported almost half the votes by Usage Panel members which Morris says were taken in preparation for the publication of AHD.

KINDS OF USAGE PROBLEMS

In order to determine the areas of concern of the editors of AHD, the "kinds" of usage problems about which Panel votes are reported have been analyzed. Usages dealt with in the 226 notes have been classified in five categories: diction, grammar, word formation, idiom, and spelling. This classification serves to reveal the relative attention devoted to various areas of usage by AHD usage notes in which a Usage Panel vote is recorded. Since some notes deal with more than one kind or category of problem, the total number of problems or rather of instances of kinds of problems in the notes containing Panel votes is 247. Table 1 reveals that, as one might expect of a dictionary, more than half the problems dealt with are in the area of diction (137), with by far the major portion of that number (90) being problems of semantic development or extension of meaning. Can *alibi* be "properly" used to mean "excuse"? Does *renege* have a meaning outside of card games? Is it "OK" to use *through* to mean "finished"? Ninety questions of this nature are dealt with. Thirty-three of the notes classified under diction deal with what I have labeled "Confusion with Other Words." Here occur the much-discussed *infer/imply, disinterested/uninterested, flaunt/flout, raise/rear, loan/lend, farther/further, nauseous/nauseated.* Smaller categories under "Diction" include the "Weakening of Absolutes" (4) – *certain, complete, equal, unique*; problems of "Association or Style" (5) – *balding, rambunctious, rile, senior citizen,* and *viewpoint*; and problems of "Redundancy" (5) – *consensus* (of opinion), *equally* (as), *rarely* (ever), (from) *whence,* and, of course, that all-time favorite, (the) *reason* (why).

Although considerably smaller than the diction category, the category grammar, with fifty-two items, is second in size. More than half the grammar items deal with matters of syntax (27): *as . . . as* vs. *so . . . as* in negative comparisons; *like* as a "conjunction"; nouns used as noun attributes; *drunk* vs. *drunken* as

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION BY "CATEGORY OF PROBLEM" OF USAGES ON WHICH AN AHD USAGE PANEL VOTE IS REPORTED

CATEGORY	SYMBOL	NUMBER OF PROBLEMS
I. DICTION (137)		
A. Semantic Extension	Dx	90
B. Confusion with Other Words	Dc	33
C. Weakening of Absolutes	Dw	4
D. Association or Style	Da	5
E. Redundancy	Dr	5
II. GRAMMAR (52)		
A. Syntax (27)	Gs	27
B. Morphology (25)		
1. Noun	Gn	6
2. Pronoun	Gp	6
3. Adjective/Adverb	Ga	5
4. Verb	Gv	8
III. IDIOM (30)		
A. Preposition	Ip	6
B. Verb plus Particle	Iv	10
C. Miscellaneous	Im	14
IV. WORD FORMATION (26)		
A. Functional Shift	Fs	17
B. Derivation	Fd	5
C. Back Formation	Fb	4
V. SPELLING (2)	S	2
TOTAL		247

an attributive modifier. The remaining twenty-five grammar items raise questions of morphology. Of the noun form problems (6), five have to do with the singular-plural problem of nouns borrowed directly from Latin: *agenda, data, errata, insignia, medium*; the other deals with the use of the expression (a) *savings* as a singular noun. There are six pronoun form problems – at least there are six different notes; four of the notes deal with nominative/objective case form choice, there is a note on the use of *myself* in compound subjects and objects, and one on *whose* as a possessive for inanimates. There are five adjective/adverb problems: *bad, good, important, quick, simultaneous,* and their adverbial counterparts. Eight verb form problems complete the grammar category: *ain't, dive, hang, prove, ring, shall, should, were.*

There are thirty problems of idiom. Six involve preposition choice: *(in) back of/behind, oblivious to/of,* etc.; ten involve particles (prepositions or adverbs) used with verbs: *blame on/blame, compare with/to, suffer from/with,* etc.; fourteen idiom problems are subclassified as miscellaneous — meaning, as usual, that they do not fit easily elsewhere in this system of classification: *try and/try to, (not) about (to), provided/providing (that),* etc.

Word formation accounts for twenty-six problems, the majority (18) involving functional shift: the use of *above* as an adjective or noun, of *alibi* as a verb, of *author* as a verb; there are five derivation problems, including, of course, *finalize* and the suffix *-wise*; back-formation accounts for four problems: *commentate, enthuse, escalate, headquarter.* Two spelling problems complete the list: *Xmas* and *busing/bussing.*

Altogether the 226 usage notes deal with 247 specific problems classified according to kind. Nineteen of the notes deal with two different "kinds" of problem or two problems of the same kind; one note, at *but,* deals with three different problems. Appendix 5 provides a complete listing of usage notes classified as to kind. Appendix 6 lists the twenty notes which deal with more than one problem.

Medium of Expression

As was described above, a number of the problems treated are presented in the usage notes in more than one specific guise, the problem of *ain't,* for example, having been voted upon in the frames "Ain't I?", "It ain't likely," and "Aren't I?" The number of instances of problems is 318. That is, in the 226 notes, which treat 247 different problems classified as to kind, there are 318 specific samples of usage on which a Panel vote is reported. Table 2 analyzes these 318 votes, showing whether a vote deals with the use of the locution in question in writing, in speech, in both speech and writing with specific percentages reported for each, or the vote, as reported, is noncommittal regarding the use of the locution in speech or in writing. More than half of the 318 votes (197) are nonspecific as to whether the approval

TABLE 2

AHD USAGE PANEL VOTES ON USAGES IN SPEECH, IN WRITING, IN BOTH, AND NONSPECIFIC AS TO MEDIUM

	NUMBER OF VOTES
Votes dealing with use in writing only	95
Votes dealing with use in speech only	3
Votes dealing with use in both speech and writing	23
Votes nonspecific as to medium of expression	197
TOTAL	318

Note: Occasionally use in either writing or speech may be implied either by the nature of the usage item or by the language of the usage note. Unless use in speech or writing is specifically designated in the note, however, votes have been classified as nonspecific as to medium.

or disapproval relates to the use of the item in speech or in writing; 3 votes deal with use in speech only, 95 with use in writing only, and 23 with use in both speech and writing.

As is so often the case in analyzing AHD performance in the reporting of Usage Panel opinions, the motivation underlying the decision to request or publish a vote dealing with the use of a locution in writing, in speech, in both, or in nonspecified use is not possible to determine. In the usage note for *can*, for example, specific votes are reported on four different frames offering the *can/may* option. For "Those who need an additional day to prepare may have it," it is reported that 70 percent of the Usage Panel specify *may* if the sample sentence is considered as an example in writing. For "May I have an additional day?" 77 percent of the Panel are reported as specifying *may* in writing and 60 percent as specifying *may* in formal speech. For "Why can't I have an additional day to prepare?" *can*, or rather *can't*, is reported as acceptable to 89 percent of the Panel "on all levels of speech." For the final sample evaluated, "You cannot (or can't) have additional time," the report is that *can* is acceptable to 72 percent "on all levels of speech." There is, then, one case of *can/may* on which an opinion is offered regarding its use in writing, one with a vote regarding its use in writing and formal speech, and two with votes regarding its use "on all levels of speech."

In another usage note, that for *ring*, an editorial statement says, "*Rang* (not *rung*) is the usual form in the past tense, especially in written usage." The remainder of the note reports that 85 percent of the Usage Panel consider *rung* unacceptable in speech. Apparently the editors considered the written usage noncontroversial and the spoken controversial; the size of the Panel vote suggests that, at least for that group, the use of *rung* as a preterit in speech is hardly controversial. All in all, it is not possible to see a clear rationale for editorial decisions to request or report Usage Panel opinions on the use of a locution in speech, in writing, in both, or with no reference to medium of expression. In fact, as in the case of the entry *can* described above, the decisions often seem whimsical.

The fact that some usages were apparently voted upon twice — once as to use in speech, once as to use in writing — provides one final statistic to round out our analysis of the size or extent of the directly reported influence of the Usage Panel on AHD usage statements. As has been indicated several times, 226 usage notes include reports of Panel votes; these notes deal with 247 different instances of problems when the problems are classified as to kind; and votes on 318 actual samples of usages are reported. Twenty-three of those samples were voted upon twice — once as to use in speech, once as to use in writing. This produces a total of 341 actual reports of Panel votes. It is interesting, but not really very significant except as a further manifestation of the random and undisciplined nature of the entire enterprise, that four of these reports of votes do not state a percentage; instead they use expressions such as "a substantial majority of the Usage Panel" or "the Usage Panel specifies."

EDITORIAL HANDLING OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: USE OF RESTRICTIVE LABELS

One more aspect of the relationship between editorial opinion and Panel opinion further heightens the impression that the editors are often cavalier in their handling of the questionnaire results. It would seem reasonable to assume that, if the editors had a high regard for Panel opinions, they would use those opinions as a basis for the assignment of restrictive labels — what William Morris referred to as "usage-context indicators." The

"Guide to the Dictionary," prepared by Norman Hoss, lists the restrictive labels used in the AHD:

> The labels that indicate restricted usage one way or another are: *Nonstandard, Informal, Slang, Vulgar, Obsolete, Archaic, Rare, Poetic, Regional* (plus labels indicating specific regions), *British*, and foreign-language labels such as *French*.[23]

The most surprising – almost astounding – finding, when we examine the entries for application of restrictive labels to senses on which usage notes are provided, is that *only two* of these labels – *Nonstandard* and *Informal* – are applied to usages on which a Usage Panel vote is reported, and those two infrequently. This finding is especially surprising in view of the evidence provided by other dictionaries. As we shall see below, other dictionaries have applied with fairly high frequency to the locutions under study the labels *Slang, Colloquial, Dialectal, U.S.*, and a few others.

Almost equally surprising is the imperfect correlation between editorially applied labels, when they do occur, and Usage Panel votes on the labeled items. Table 3 lists the entries in which the two labels occur and indicates the Panel vote as a percentage approving the disputed usage. Seven items are labeled by the editors as *Nonstandard*, with Panel approval ranging from 1 to 76 percent; thirty items are labeled *Informal*, with Panel approval ranging from 0 to 92(!) percent. Seven of the items labeled *Informal* are reported as being unrestrictedly approved by more than 50 percent of the Usage Panel.

The contrast between editorial judgment, as expressed in labeling, and Panel opinion, as expressed in percentage finding a usage acceptable, is even more startling when one realizes that nearly one-fourth of the items labeled *Informal* receive approval by more than 50 percent of the Panel, five items being approved specifically for use in writing and the other two receiving general approval, nonspecific as to medium. One example should serve to make clear the gap between editors and Panel. *Shakedown* in the sense of "extortion" is labeled *Informal*, but 67 percent of the Panel approve its use as a verb (*to shake down*) and 80 percent approve its use as a noun. A reading of the complete note highlights the apparent division between editorial and Panel opinion:

Shakedown (noun) in the sense of extortion and the related verb form *shake down* are not appropriate to deliberately formal usage, but have won increasing acceptance on all other levels. As examples in writing, the follow-

TABLE 3

AHD USE OF RESTRICTIVE LABELS IN ENTRIES CONTAINING A USAGE NOTE WITH A USAGE PANEL VOTE

Usages Labeled *NONSTANDARD* (7)

Entry	Percentage of Panel Accepting
ain't	01 (w,s) -16 (s)
bimonthly	16
disinterested	07
flaunt	09
like	25-76
ring	15 (s)
sometime	30

Usages Labeled *INFORMAL* (30)

Entry	Percentage of Panel Accepting	Entry	Percentage of Panel Accepting
alibi	41 (w)	headquarter	10
•balance	53 (w)	host	18
•balding	55	mighty	11 (w), 56 (s)
bit	13	most	08 (w), 47 (s)
bus	48 (w)	OK	20-57 (w)
buy	39 (w)	quote	15 (w)
can	23-30 (w), 40 (fs) -89 (s)	rate	26-35 (w)
cohort	31 (f)	•rattle	86 (w)
•condition	74	•shakedown	67-80 (w)
contact	34 (f)	some	13
cope	25 (fw)	someplace	17 (w)
•dope	86-92 (w)	someway	17 (w)
enthuse	24-28	tend	20 (w)
gift	06	•tycoon	90 (w)
good	0-14 (w), 27 (s)	Xmas	12 (w)

•Seven items labeled *INFORMAL* but approved without apparent restriction by more than 50 percent of the AHD Usage Panel.

Note: Included here are *all* cases in which the AHD entry contains a restrictive label applied to the sense of the entry word on which a Usage Panel vote is reported. Votes are shown as percentages of Panel accepting a labeled usage. The letters *f, w,* and *s* in parentheses following the percentages indicate, respectively, that the vote specifies *formal, spoken,* or *written* use.

ing are acceptable to majorities of the Usage Panel: *The committee found no evidence of a shakedown* (accepted by 80 per cent). *He was convicted of shaking down three film executives* (accepted by 67 per cent).

Whether the questionnaire submitted to the Panel expressly restricted the written use to writing "other than deliberately formal" is not clear. Even if it had, "consciously formal" writing is characterized in the questionnaire as appropriate to diplomatic documents. Many usages not appropriate to diplomatic documents could not reasonably be classified as *Informal.*

Looked at from any angle, AHD labeling practice as applied to the items under study is puzzling. Certain usages which receive a very low number of approval votes from the Panel are classified as *Nonstandard* or *Informal,* and others receiving equally low numbers of votes are not. Seven usages are labeled *Nonstandard*: those in the entries *ain't, bimonthly, disinterested, flaunt, like, ring,* and *sometime.* Leaving out of account the anomaly that one example of what is labeled a *Nonstandard* usage – the use of *like* in "The dress looked like new," was deemed acceptable by 76 percent of the Panel, the Panel votes on these items range from 1 to 30 percent approval. More than 100 of the 341 Panel votes reported in AHD indicate 30 percent or less approval of the item in question. What is it that makes the above seven items Nonstandard and the other ninety-odd standard (if that is the implication of the absence of a label)?

Finally, there is often some indication in the entry or in the usage note that a locution is informal, but that locution is not so labeled. There are, for instance, a number of notes in which Panel votes are reported as approving a usage *except in formal circumstances,* and the entry for the item in question bears no label. For instance, 77 percent of the Panel are reported as accepting the metaphorical use of *trigger* as a verb as most appropriate "to what is not expressly formal." It is difficult to read the note without concluding that the use of *trigger* in question is informal. Yet the sense is not so labeled. It could be argued, of course, that it is redundant to indicate both by application of a label and by mention in a usage note that a locution is, for instance, appropriate to informal circumstances only. If the argument is accepted, however, the problem remains of justifying the use of labels described above.

The above examples and comparisons indicate that labeling practice in AHD is, as has been the case with every aspect of AHD handling of usage we have so far examined, characterized by a kind of randomness which raises serious questions about the objectivity of labeling practice and about the usefulness or meaningfulness of the labels themselves. The presence or absence of a label seems as much a function of editorial whim as of any other discernible operating principle.

The Reporting of AHD Usage Panel Votes

If, as the AHD editors so strongly claim, the opinions of practitioners of writing constitute valuable and useful information about current usage, it would seem that those opinions should best be reported in such a way as to let the opinions speak for themselves. As has been seen to be the case in the planning and execution of the AHD method for securing expert opinions and in editorial use or non-use of those opinions in appropriate areas, the reporting of Panel opinions seems not to meet the criterion of objectivity. Four aspects of the reporting of Panel votes seem to vitiate objectivity: the terminology of approval/disapproval; the occasional and unsystematic inclusion in the notes of comments by Panel members; the occasional use of "only" before the percentage reported in a vote; and irregularity in the reporting of votes as percentage approving or percentage disapproving. All these practices serve to make the notes difficult to interpret and to decrease whatever strength and objectivity might be gained by the practice of reporting Panel opinions in what seem to be objective, quantitative terms.

Terminology of Approval and Disapproval

The terminology of approval and disapproval used in the AHD usage notes has possibly, even probably, been varied to render the style of the notes more pleasing; if so, that purpose is served at the expense of comparability of opinion. Here is the usage note for *back*:

> Fifty-three per cent of the Usage Panel condemn *back of* (for *behind*) in writing: *a mile back of the front lines*. Fifty per cent reject *in back of* (for *behind*) in writing: *the location in back of a warehouse*.

What is the difference, one wonders, between rejection and condemnation? Is it 3 percent of the Panel? Is one worse or more damning than the other? The same kind of question may be raised about other notes. In the usage note for *medium*, the use of *media* as a singular is reported as "unacceptable in writing to 90 per cent of the Usage Panel, and in speech to 88 per cent." The use of *medias* as a plural, the note says, "is condemned even more severely."

The usage note for *loan* presents a peculiar case of the weakening of what is really an expression of disapproval:

> *Loan* has long been established as a verb, especially in business usage. *Lend* is considered by many to be preferable to *loan* in general usage, however, and particularly in formal writing. More than 70 per cent of the Usage Panel express such a preference. . . .

What this note really says is that 70 percent of the Panel find the use of *loan* as a verb unacceptable. In the usage note for *only*, an editorial statement says that "careful" placement of *only* when used as an adverb means that *only* must "adjoin the word or group of words it actually limits." The Usage Panel, we are told in the following sentence, "specifies precise placement" in a number of examples which are given. In each of the above cases, the use of "condemned even more severely," "express such a preference," "specifies precise placement," creates difficulties of interpretation.

The great majority of the AHD usage notes use the terms "acceptable" or "unacceptable" or their variants "accept," "acceptably," etc. Among approval terms used in addition to "accept" are "approve," "proper choice," "permissible," and "show preference for." The lexicon of unacceptability is, as might be expected, richer, including "condemn," "strongly condemned," "restrict," "rigidly restricted," "distasteful," "not mere substitutes," "not appropriate," and "condemned more severely." This variation in terminology in the usage notes may seem a minor matter, but as it seems unlikely that any normal user of the dictionary would read all or a significant number of the usage notes seriatim, such stylistic variation seems unnecessary and, because each term or phrase used has its own connotation or "weight" — *approval*, for instance, seems more enthusiastic and positive than *acceptance* – detracts somewhat from the ostensible objectivity achieved by presenting Panel opinions as percentages.

The Use of Quotations

A second AHD editorial practice which has the effect of lessening the air of impartiality and hence the usefulness of the notes including Panel votes is the practice of including occasionally – only very occasionally, in fact – a quotation from the observations added to the questionnaires by the Panel members. Isaac Asimov is reported as finding the word *balding* "distasteful but necessary"; Katherine Anne Porter finds the same word "entirely vulgar." Fifty-five percent of the members of the Panel find the usage acceptable. What is gained, one wonders, by the gratuitous inclusion of these comments by two Panel members, one evidently from among the majority, albeit reluctantly, and the other from the opposing minority? On balance, I suppose that the effect of the inclusion of these comments is to suggest that the majority is not to be followed. After all, who wants to use a word which is distasteful and "entirely vulgar," majority notwithstanding?

Dwight Macdonald is quoted as finding the use of *better* to mean "more than" "Rustic and illogical. Is anything *better* or *worse* than a mile?" The usage is unacceptable to 69 percent of the Panel. Again, the effect seems to be to intensify the atmosphere of condemnation. Of the use of *most* in the sense "very" Paul Horgan is reported as writing. "This has value as emphasis"; of the same usage, Virgil Thomson says, "adds emphasis to speech, weakness to writing." Eighty-six percent of the Panel approve the usage in writing, 96 percent in speech. What impact is added to this overwhelming majority by the inclusion of these rather vapid comments? The process of "adding weakness" is, incidentally, interesting to contemplate against the background of linguistic logicality projected by the AHD.

In another usage note, 95 percent of the Panel condemn the use of *myself* as part of a compound object; its use in a compound subject is "also strongly condemned." Perhaps in an attempt to soften the effects of the dereliction of the errant 5 percent of the Panel, the following comments are included in the note: Gilbert Highet – "a prissy evasion of *me*"; Walter "Red"

Smith – "the refuge of idiots taught early that *me* is a dirty word." The comments are, I suppose, appropriately pungent and condescending, and if the purpose is to add spice to an otherwise dull page, the purpose is no doubt served. No harm is done to the usage note, so far as I can see; the air of strong condemnation is not vitiated.

But the real problem is not the effect of including a quotation or two in a given note. Quotations appear in only two notes other than those already referred to – the note at *ain't* and that at *between*; all told, only six notes of the 226 contain quoted remarks. If the practice is defensible in a few notes, it should be followed in all. Even the fact that there were no comments made about an item might be useful information – indicating that nobody felt very strongly about it. As is so often the case in our analysis of AHD, what is deserving of criticism here is not necessarily the practice described, but the errant and whimsical application of the practice.

The Use of "Only"

In addition to variation in terms of approval and disapproval and to the practice of occasionally inserting at random a comment by one or more of the Panel members on a given usage, a third curious characteristic of the AHD method of reporting Usage Panel opinion deserves mention. Table 4 lists by entry word under which they appear twenty-nine Panel votes in which the percentage of acceptance reported is preceded by the word "only." An analysis of the votes preceded by "only" reveals no apparent rationale for the use of the qualifier. Just about one-half the uses (15) occur in usage notes in which more than one sample or example of a questioned locution is voted on. The votes on the other usages (not preceded by "only") in each of those entries are shown in parentheses following the percentage preceded by "only." In eight of those cases – *alibi, different, individual, noun, OK, so, while,* and *zoom* – the difference between the percentage reported for the other item or items in the note and the percentage preceded by "only" might in some way justify the heightening of the contrast in number of approval votes.

TABLE 4

AHD USAGE NOTES IN WHICH THE PERCENTAGE OF ACCEPTANCE IS PRECEDED BY THE QUALIFIER "ONLY"

Entry	Percentage Preceded by "Only"	Other Percentages Reported in Note
about	40	
alibi	21	(41)
all	39	
appreciate	47	
balance	53	
bus	48	(50)
commentate	09	(19)
different	11, 17	(44)
hang	31	(34)
help	42	
hopefully	44	
individual	38	(55, 47)
lack	42	
materialize	33	
negotiate	46	
noun	29	(87, 63, 57)
OK	23, 20	(57, 42)
personality	43	
practically	51, 46	
prove	27	
so	44	(83)
sometime	30	
were	26	(31, 22, 19)
while	37	(68, 59)
wish	39	
zoom	31	(61)

In other notes involving the report of more than one vote, however, this seems not to be the case. In *bus*, for instance, the Panel vote on the spelling of *busing/bussing* is exactly 50 percent; 48 percent approval of the use of *bus* as a verb is hardly "only" in contrast. In *commentate*, the contrast is between 19 percent and "only" 9 percent – about like a contrast between "dead" and "really dead." In *hang*, the contrast is between 34 and "only" 31 percent. In the case of *practically*, two votes are reported in the note, and *both* are preceded by "only." Of four examples in the entry *were*, the usage note reads, "*Was* is acceptable to only 26 percent in the first example, to 22 per cent in the second, to 19 per cent in the third, and to 31 per cent in the last. . . ." The repetition of *to* in each of the last three phrases makes clear, if I read it correctly, that "only" modifies only the first percentage. This yields the ultimate – an "only" percentage which is larger than the two following figures. At any rate, the remainder (14) of the votes preceded by "only" occur in notes in which only one vote is reported, so the purpose certainly cannot be to heighten a contrast between levels of acceptance of two or more uses of the same locution.

The tally of votes preceded by "only" provided in Table 5 shows that the majority of the "only" votes fall between 30 and 50 percent (the median vote is 38 percent). Two of the "only" votes are above 50 percent: *practically* (51 percent) and *balance* (53 percent). This finding makes the use of "only" seem even more curious. As will be shown later, the midpoint for all percentage votes recorded for all items voted on in the AHD falls between 40 and 49 percent. That being the case, to call a vote of, say, 47 percent "only" 47 percent is like referring to an I.Q. as "only" 100. It would seem that if a vote were quite low (less than, say, 25 percent approval) the level of the vote alone would express strong enough stricture so that no qualifiers would be necessary to point it up. If a vote were higher, it would seem that to modify it by "only" would be in some way misleading.

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that for those items on which a vote is reported as "only" and the percentage is at or near the 50 percent level the "only" represents a wish on the part of the editor that the figure were lower; that is, the editor strongly disapproves of the usage in question and attempts, consciously or unconsciously, by adding "only" to leave the impression that the level of approval is lower than in fact it is. Of the 341 votes recorded in the AHD, 188 indicate acceptance of the

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION BY DECILE OF VOTES IN USAGE NOTES IN WHICH THE PERCENTAGE IS PRECEDED BY THE QUALIFIER "ONLY"

DECILE	1 0-9%	2 10-19%	3 20-29%	4 30-39%	5 40-49%	6 50-59%	TOTAL VOTES
No. of Votes	1	2	6	8	10	2	29

questioned usage by less than 50 percent of the Usage Panel; more than one-half of the items voted on receive approval by less than one-half the Panel. It is not possible to discern any rational basis for the addition of the qualifier "only" in the report of 27 of those 188 votes which fall below 50 percent.

REPORTING OF VOTES AS APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL

The reporting of votes by the Usage Panel members has been shown above to have been somewhat less than consistent in style and format, and some questions have been raised as the motivations underlying some of the apparent vagaries in the reporting style. One more matter remains to be examined in the area of reporting: the reporting of votes as positive or negative votes -- as percentage of acceptance or of nonacceptance. That is, if 35 percent of the Panel disapprove of a usage and 65 percent approve, which percentage is reported? Marckwardt's analysis of AHD practice in this matter led him to conclude the following:

> . . . in general the AHD policy seems to have been to report the higher percentage, no matter whether it indicated acceptability or rejection, but there are some curious deviations, as for example the notes on *wish* in the sense of "want" and the compound form *senior citizen*, where percentages of acceptability of less than 50 were reported.[24]

It has already been shown (in Table 4) that there are at least twenty-seven instances of reporting of a percentage of less than 50 — in twenty-seven of the twenty-nine cases in which the percentage reported is preceded by "only." *Wish* is on that list; *senior citizen* is not. A quick look at Table 4 will reveal that, in those cases in which more than one vote is included in the usage note, ten of the nineteen "higher" percentages of approval reported are 50 percent or less. An analysis of the approval votes for all items in the entries beginning with *A* reveals that of twenty-two votes reported, six, or more than one-quarter, are votes of 50 percent or less. In short, it seems that there are more than a few "curious" deviations from the practice of reporting the higher percentage.

Most interesting in this respect is the relative number of approval and disapproval votes and the differences between the two sets in consistency in application of the practice of reporting the higher percentage. Actually, reported votes fall into three major categories rather than two – votes of approval, votes of disapproval, and votes reported as identifying one option or another as the "only" one accepted in connection with a particular usage.[25] For instance, in the usage note for *bad*, it is reported of "He felt bad (ill)," and "He looked bad (ill)," that according to 75 percent of the Usage Panel "*bad* is the only acceptable form in the foregoing examples, in writing; 69 percent accept only *bad* in speech." What these votes really do is *disapprove* of a questioned usage, the use of *badly* in such frames. Therefore, such votes are classified as votes of nonacceptance or disapproval of a questioned usage.

Classifying all such "only form acceptable" votes as disapproval votes, there are 195 votes of approval included in the 226 usage notes under study and 146 votes of disapproval. There is far greater consistency in the reporting of disapprovals in terms of the larger percentage. Although the "only form acceptable" votes range as low as 11 percent, *all* of the votes using the words "condemn," "disapprove," "reject," etc. involve percentages of 51 or larger. Approval votes, as we have seen, are reported both above and below 50 percent, but *all* instances in which a percentage of 50 or less is reported are in the categories "approved" or "only form acceptable." As has been the case with the other irregularities in reporting style studied, there is no obvious explanation for this irregular practice. The effect seems to be an intensification of the sense of proscription in the entire body of notes, but there is no indication that this is purposeful. Suffice it to say that the practice contributes to the general impression of randomness, whim-following, and potential covert or subconscious editorial desire to express disagreement with the Usage Panel.

DIFFERENCES IN AHD USAGE PANEL JUDGMENTS OF DIFFERENT KINDS OF USAGE PROBLEMS

The aspect of randomness in AHD reporting of Panel votes which has just been discussed makes it extremely difficult to form any general impression of Usage Panel attitudes toward the whole body of questioned usages. Votes are randomly reported, as has been demonstrated, as votes of approval or disapproval. To facilitate comparability, in the discussion which follows and in the tables and appendixes in this study, all votes, unless otherwise indicated, have been converted to percentages of the Panel *approving* a questioned usage. It is reported, for instance, in the AHD usage note for *author*, that 81 percent of the Panel disapprove of the use of *author* as a transitive verb as in "to author a work"; the vote on *author* has been converted to 19 percent, since apparently 19 percent accept or do not disapprove of that usage. This conversion of all votes into positive or "acceptance of questioned usage" votes makes the votes susceptible of straightforward and nonconfusing comparative and contrastive analysis.

This practice of reporting, in tabulations and elsewhere in this study, votes of the Panel as votes of approval or acceptance of a disputed usage, even when the AHD usage note in question furnishes only a percentage of the Panel who disapprove that usage, may produce some distortion in findings, but that distortion will be negligible. Information is usually lacking as to whether those Panel members who do not disapprove or refuse to accept a usage automatically approve it, but the few usage notes which furnish votes of both kinds show that it is generally safe to assume so. The note with the greatest discrepancy is that for *none*; we are told that 68 percent of the Usage Panel say that *none* may take either a singular or a plural verb, but 28 percent believe it must always take a singular verb. Four percent of the Panel is left unaccounted for. Since a specific percentage of Panel members approving a disputed usage is furnished in this note (68 percent), that figure is used in tabulations and elsewhere in this study. Had only the 28 percent vote been included in the note, the inverse, or 72 percent, would have been used here. It is quite unlikely that this slight difference would have any significant effect on findings, especially as, as we shall see further on, it is not possible to determine clearly the significance, if any, of far larger differences in approval rates.

A distribution by deciles of the votes of the Usage Panel is shown in Table 6. The percentage ranges at the top of each column represent percentages approving a questioned usage, as explained above; the figures in the body of the table represent the number of approval votes reported by decile and by kind of problem. The usages are classified into kinds of problem as has been explained above in connection with Table 1.

The analysis displayed in Table 6 reveals some interesting and potentially significant variation in Panel judgment of usage problems of different kinds. The midpoint approval vote for all problems occurs in the fifth decile (40-49 percent). This means, of course, that slightly less than one-half of all the items voted on received approval by 50 percent or more of the Usage Panel. For the word formation problems included in these usage notes, the midpoint occurs in the third decile (20-29 percent). The Panel were obviously far more negative in their reactions to word formation problems called to their attention than they were in respect to the totality of problems on which their opinions were requested. The midpoint for items of grammar and idiom is in the fourth decile (30-39 percent). One-half of the items dealing with grammar or idiom were deemed acceptable by less than 40 percent of the Panel. Actually, in the case of grammar items, the midpoint falls just at 30 percent, so disapproval here is about as severe as in the case of problems of word formation: that is to say, almost as large a proportion of questioned items are disapproved of by large numbers of Panel members.

The most interesting set of votes is that dealing with the largest category of items. Diction problems account for 167 or just a few less than one-half of the total votes cast by the Panel. The midpoint for approval votes on diction problems occurs in the seventh decile (60-69 percent). This means that fully one-half of the questioned items of usage dealing with word choice included in this survey were approved by 60 percent or more of the Usage Panel. As can be seen in Table 6, diction is the only category in which approval votes in excess of 90 percent (nine votes) occur, and by far the majority of the approval votes of 60 percent or larger occur in this category (85 out of 112). Conversely, in approval votes of less than 30 percent, diction problems account for only 28 out of 113. No generalizations are possible about problems of spelling as there are, another curiosity, only two items on which Panel judgment was solicited — *Xmas* and *busing/bussing*.

In summary, problems of diction appear to be treated highly "permissively" by the AHD Usage Panel — at least one-half such problems receiving approval from more than 60 percent of the Panel. This finding is in such dramatic contrast to the relatively

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION BY DECILE OF AHD USAGE PANEL VOTES OF ACCEPTANCE: PROBLEMS CLASSIFIED AS TO CATEGORY

DECILE PERCENTAGE	1 0-9	2 10-19	3 20-29	4 30-39	5 40-49	6 50-59	7 60-69	8 70-79	9 80-89	10 90-100	TOTAL
Category of Problem:											
Diction	6	13	9	22	14	18	29[a]	23	24	9	167
Grammar	17	16	16[a]	11	7	10	9	7	4	0	97
Idiom	4	5	5	6[a]	9	5	0	1	2	0	37
Word Formation	7	9	5[a]	3	3	3	1	3	0	0	34
Spelling	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	34	44	35	42	33[a]	37	39	34	30	9	337

[a] Decile in which midpoint of votes occurs.

Note: Four Panel opinions are not included here, as they are reported in the usage note in question without a specification of percentage. They are the votes on *only* (a), and *participle* (a, b, c).

lower level of "permissiveness" demonstrated by the Panel in the other three major categories that it invites further investigation.

VARIATIONS IN AHD USAGE PANEL REACTIONS WITHIN FOUR CATEGORIES OF USAGE PROBLEM

As has been demonstrated, there are striking variations in AHD Usage Panel acceptance of questioned usages when voting patterns are compared in four major categories of problems. Diction items receive the largest proportion of approval votes, word formation and grammar problems the smallest proportion, and idiom problems receive a slightly higher proportion of approval votes than do word formation and grammar problems. Appendix 5, described earlier (p. 24), analyzes by kind or category of problem the usage notes in AHD which include a record of Usage Panel vote. Appendix 7 combines the data of Appendix 5 with that of Table 6, in which numbers of approval votes are tallied by decile and by kind or category of problem. Appendix 7 ranks by decile and by entry word and by category every reported vote of the Usage Panel.

Analysis of the data in Appendix 7 shows that the Usage Panel vary greatly in the rate at which they accept or approve usages within two categories when those usages are subcategorized for further analysis. There are no striking variations in Panel votes within the two smaller categories: Idiom (Table 7) and Word Formation (Table 8). In each of these two categories, the Panel are generally quite consistent in condemning or disapproving by substantial majorities a majority of the items presented for consideration. In the case of idiom problems, more than one-half the total number of questioned usages are considered acceptable by less than 40 percent of the Panel. Midpoints of approval for subcategories range only between the third and the fifth deciles, and the midpoint for the entire Idiom category is in the fourth decile.

The Panel are slightly more severe in their judgment of word formation problems: almost two-thirds of the 34 items in the category are considered acceptable by less than 30 percent of the Panel. There appears to be no significant difference in respect to subcategories of word formation problems. Midpoints are all in the second and third deciles, with the midpoint for the entire category falling also in the third decile. The number of items in two of the three subcategories is so small as to render comparisons meaningless. Suffice it to say that level of Panel ap-

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION BY DECILE OF AHD USAGE PANEL APPROVAL VOTES ON QUESTIONED USAGES IN THE CATEGORY *IDIOM*

Subcategory / Decile		Preposition	Verb/ Particle	Miscel-laneous	Total
10	90-100%	0	0	0	0
9	80-89%	0	1	1	2
8	70-79%	0	1	0	1
7	60-69%	0	0	0	0
6	50-59%	3	0	2	5
5	40-49%	2[a]	1	6[a]	9
4	30-39%	0	2	4	6[a]
3	20-29%	0	3[a]	2	5
2	10-19%	1	1	3	5
1	0-9%	1	3	0	4
TOTAL		7	12	18	37

[a] Midpoint.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION BY DECILE OF AHD USAGE PANEL APPROVAL VOTES ON QUESTIONED USAGES IN THE *WORD FORMATION*

Subcategory / Decile		Functional Shift	Derivation	Back Formation	Total
10	90-100%	0	0	0	0
9	80-89%	0	0	0	0
8	70-79%	2	0	1	3
7	60-69%	0	1	0	1
6	50-59%	3	0	0	3
5	40-49%	2	1	0	3
4	30-39%	3	0	0	3
3	20-29%	3[a]	0	2	5[a]
2	10-19%	5	2[a]	2[a]	9
1	0-9%	4	1	2	7
TOTAL		22	5	7	34

[a] Midpoint.

proval for word formation items is generally quite low, with a few exceptions.

Analysis of the Panel votes on items classified as Grammar (Table 9) reveals wider internal variation. Items in this category have been subclassified under Syntax or Morphology, with Morphology being still further subclassified into Noun, Pronoun, Adjective/adverb, and Verb problems. For all grammar problems, the midpoint is at 30 percent approval; that is, one-half the questioned usages are deemed acceptable by less than 30 percent of the Panel. An examination of the Morphology subcategory reveals that noun and pronoun usage problems are treated most severely, one-half of the usages presented being judged acceptable by fewer than 20 percent of the Panel members. Adjective/adverb and verb usage problems are judged only slightly less severely, one-half of the usages in each of these subcategories being voted acceptable by less than 30 percent of the Panel. For all morphology problems combined, the midpoint of approval votes is in the third decile, the 20-29 percent range.

Usages in the Syntax subcategory are regarded more favorably. Votes on these range up to slightly less than 90 percent approval for a few items, with the midpoint occurring in the 40-49 percent range; slightly fewer than one-half the specific usages under Syntax receive approval from 50 percent or more of the Panel. Syntax problems are viewed less negatively, evidently, than are questioned variations in Morphology.

The Diction category (Table 10) presents the most extreme internal variability, and it contrasts with the other categories in the rate of overall acceptance of questioned usages. This largest of all categories, containing 167 items, is broken down into five subcategories: Semantic Extension, Confusion with Other Words, Weakening of Absolutes, Association or Style, and Redundancy. Of the five, the two containing by far the largest number of items are Extension (107) and Confusion (45).

One-half of the items in the Diction category receive approval by more than 60 percent of the Usage Panel. In the Extension subcategory, the scale of acceptance corresponds to that for the entire Diction category, with one-half the items receiving approval from 60 percent or more of the Panel. Only two of the 107 items in this subcategory are deemed acceptable by less than 20 percent of the Panel. By contrast, one-third of the usages in the Confusion subcategory receive approval by less than 20 percent of the Panel, and the midpoint for acceptance is in the 30-39 percent range, one-half of the items receiving approval from less than 40 percent of the Panel. The three smaller subcategories – Weakening, Association, and Redundancy – contain, respectively, four, five, and six items, in no case a large enough number to support any broad conclusions. The midpoints of approval votes for these three subcategories vary greatly, however, falling in the 70-79 percent range for Weakening, in the 60-69 percent range for Association, and in the 30-39 percent range for the Redundancy subcategory.

With such a generally high rate of acceptance prevailing in the Diction category, the question naturally arises as to what, if anything, seems to distinguish those usages receiving very low rates of approval in this category from the majority which are viewed much more favorably. Only six items in the Diction category received votes of approval from less than 10 percent of the Panel. Five of the items are in the Confusion with Other Words subcategory: *disinterested, enormity, flaunt, infer, most*; one is in the Weakening of Absolutes subcategory: *unique*. The six are clearly, with one exception, usages which are among the most

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION BY DECILE OF AHD USAGE PANEL APPROVAL VOTES ON QUESTIONED USAGES IN THE CATEGORY *GRAMMAR*

SUBCATEGORY			MORPHOLOGY				
	DECILE	SYNTAX	NOUN	PRONOUN	ADJ/ADV	VERB	TOTAL
10	90-100%	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	80-89%	2	1	0	0	1	4
8	70-79%	4	1	1	0	1	7
7	60-69%	5	0	2	0	2	9
6	50-59%	5	3	1	1	0	10
5	40-49%	5[a]	0	1	0	1	7
4	30-39%	6	0	0	2	3	11
3	20-29%	7	0	1	4[a]	4[a]	16[a]
2	10-19%	3	4[a]	3[a]	3	3	16
1	0-9%	4	2	5	3	3	17
TOTAL		41	11	14	13	18	97

[a] Midpoint.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION BY DECILE OF AHD USAGE PANEL APPROVAL VOTES ON QUESTIONED USAGES IN THE CATEGORY *DICTION*

Subcategory Decile			Confusion With Other Words	Weakening of Absolutes	Assoc. or Style	Redundancy	Total
10	90-100%	8	1	0	0	0	9
9	80-89%	15	7	1	1	0	24
8	70-79%	17	4	1[a]	1	0	23
7	60-69%	24[a]	3	1	1[a]	0	29[a]
6	50-59%	16	1	0	1	0	18
5	40-49%	9	4	0	1	0	14
4	30-39%	12	5[a]	0	0	5[a]	22
3	20-29%	4	5	0	0	0	9
2	10-19%	2	10	0	0	1	13
1	0-9%	0	5	1	0	0	6
TOTAL		107	45	4	5	6	167

[a] Midpoint.

frequently and vehemently proclaimed shibboleths of the latter half of the twentieth century. The exception, *most*, is a curious anomaly in the entire group of AHD Usage Notes. At issue in this item is the elision of the first syllable of the word *almost* as in the expression "Most everyone agrees." Ninety-two percent of the Panel find this usage unacceptable in writing; 53 percent condemn it in speech. Although it is in this study classified in the subcategory Confusion with Other Words, *most* appears to be a problem in enunciation rather than in semantic overlap. No other usage note in AHD deals with a problem in phonology.

In the next decile, the 10-19 percent approval range, are thirteen more diction items: *bimonthly, bit, due, farther, fortuitous, mighty, nauseous, rarely, regard, some, someplace, someway*, and *unexceptional*. Two of these – *bit* and *mighty* – are semantic extension problems; one is a redundancy problem – *rarely* (ever). The remaining ten are in the subcategory Confusion with Other Words. The conclusion seems inescapable: the AHD Usage Panel have a far stronger negative set towards the practice of using words in senses which seem to overlap the semantic space occupied by other living words – especially if those other words are in some way similar in sound or spelling to the challengers – than they do towards other instances of words assuming new meanings (or reassuming old meanings). This conclusion is not really very instructive. More significant by far is the finding that approval for items in the Confusion category occurs across the entire range of percentages.

Marckwardt, after completing a survey of 137 of the 341 Panel votes, said of his analysis that it "displays more than anything else . . . a variety of attitude and feeling toward different types of linguistic development. It reveals, as well, a tendency toward a concentration of prejudice against individual instances of language change and a surprising degree of permissiveness with respect to other examples, often virtual parallels, of the same process."[26] The differently structured and more exhaustive analysis presented here confirms the soundness of Marckwardt's conclusion. No overall principle or all-embracing attitude toward kinds of variation in language can be discovered to account for the variation in rates of Panel approval among the different categories of problems, nor can any systematic basis be found for differences in severity of reaction to subclasses of problems within those categories. The AHD Usage Panel are not, of course, unique or even unusual in this arbitrariness. Their claim to homogeneity as a group and the claim that their opinions are especially deserving of our attention seem equally to be based on their sharing of a relatively small number of more or less random linguistic prejudices.

INTERPRETATION OF THE AHD USAGE PANEL VOTES

Up to this point, the question of the significance or meaning of the Usage Panel votes to the user of the AHD who seeks guidance on a specific question of usage on which a vote has been reported has not been discussed. More meaningful conclusions as to the usefulness and reliability of the AHD votes can be drawn at the conclusion of the discussion of the treatment of these usage problems in other dictionaries, usage guides, and studies of usage. For now, it seems appropriate to evaluate the significance of the votes in terms of other attempts to use a panel of experts to evaluate usage questions and in terms of the observations I and others have made of actual practice in securing and reporting the AHD Usage Panel Votes.

In his pioneering 1932 study of opinions on usage matters, Sterling Andrus Leonard collected evaluations by several hundred "experts" on some 230 items of usage which he deemed controversial.[27] The procedures used in his study are fully described below in Chapter IV; here we are concerned only with his method of reporting results. He based his findings on percentages of the group responding to his questionnaire as do the AHD usage notes. But instead of reporting the raw percentages, he interpreted the percentages to "mean" that the usages studied were *Established, Disputable,* or *Illiterate* in the following way:

> Items marked *Established* have been approved for literary or good colloquial use by at least 75% of the judges and disapproved by not more than 25%. *Disputable* items have been approved by fewer than 75% and disapproved by more than 25%. *Illiterate* items have been disapproved by more than 75% of the judges and approved by fewer than 25%.[28]

Raymond Crisp, in his 1971 study, a somewhat more sophisticated application of the method devised by Leonard, used the same percentage basis for classification of items but, in the spirit of the times and – it might be said – of objectivity, replaced the classification *Illiterate* with *Nonstandard.*[29]

When the 337 AHD Usage Panel votes are interpreted and classified according to the Leonard system, the following division into the three groups occurs: 56 of the items voted on are classified as *Established,* 186 as *Disputable,* and 95 as *Illiterate.* Table 11 summarizes the results of both the Leonard study and the AHD Usage Panel survey in these terms, providing percentages of total items in parentheses following each classification. It is clear from the table that in both cases the majority of usages are

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF RATINGS OF USAGES IN LEONARD'S *CURRENT ENGLISH USAGE* AND IN *THE AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY* FOLLOWING THE METHOD DEVISED BY LEONARD

	CURRENT ENGLISH USAGE		AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY	
RATING	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Established	71	30.8	56	16.6
Disputable	121	52.6	186	55.1
Illiterate	38	16.6	95	28.3
TOTAL	230	100.0	337	100.0

found to be *Disputable*. The essential conservatism of the AHD Usage Panel is revealed by the almost exact reversal in percentages of items classified as *Established* and *Illiterate* in the two studies.

Leonard's method (use of expert opinion) and results (classification of items as *Established, Disputable*, or *Illiterate*) were called into question by Marckwardt and Fred Walcott.[30] They searched the OED, W2, and other sources for actual evidence of usage on the 230 items on which Leonard reported opinion. They found that for the 121 items on which Leonard's experts had voted in such a way that Leonard classified them as *Disputable* there was good evidence in records of actual usage to classify 50 of them as *Literary English* and an additional 13 of them as *American Literary English*. Forty-three items were found to be demonstrably either *Colloquial English* ("found in spoken or informal written rather than in formal written English") or *Colloquial American English*.[31] They concluded that "A survey of fact rather than of opinion would, in all probability, have increased the number of established usages from seventy-one to 177." Stated otherwise, their findings were that "there are seven chances out of eight that a 'disputable' item is wholly current in standard English." Marckwardt and Walcott were led to conclude that opinions about usage are far more conservative than usage itself: "To the student of language this tabulation will demonstrate also how much more conservative a survey of opinion about language is apt to be than the facts of the language actually warrant."[32]

Two additional comparisons of the AHD Panel results with those of the Leonard, Marckwardt and Walcott, and Crisp studies demonstrate clearly the general low reliability of usage opinions by groups of "experts." Seven locutions rated as *Established* in both the Leonard and the Crisp studies and identified as *Literary English* (one, *loan*, as *American Literary English*) in the Marckwardt and Walcott study were also voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel. Table 12 shows the percentage of approval votes of the Panel and classifies those votes according to the Leonard system. Only one of the seven items – *which* – is considered *Established* by the AHD Panel; three items – *as, loan, split infinitive* – are considered *Disputable*; and three – *farther, kind, were* – *Illiterate*. Remembering that Leonard had a large and diversified panel of experts in 1932, that Marckwardt and Walcott classified items on the basis of citations in OED, in W2, and in the grammars of Jespersen, Curme, and others, and that Crisp conducted his 1971 study with an even larger and much more diversified panel of experts than either Leonard or AHD employed, the conclusion is inescapable: based on these seven items, at least, the AHD Panel evaluation of items is ultraconservative, at best idiosyncratic, and probably unreliable.

An analysis of AHD Panel judgments on a larger number of items which were rated *Established* in the more contemporary Crisp study confirms the above finding and in addition raises questions about the reliability of any use of a panel of experts to develop information on usage. Table 13 shows in deciles the percentages of the AHD Panel voting acceptance of 36 items rated *Established* in the Crisp study. Of thirty-nine votes cast by the AHD Panel on these 36 items, five rate the locution in question *Established*, twenty-one as *Disputable*, and thirteen as *Nonstandard*. So negative a correlation between the two sets of "experts" more than casts doubt on the efficacy of the employment of a panel as authorities on usage. It demonstrates clearly that the method is *not* dependable.

TABLE 12

AHD USAGE PANEL PERCENTAGE OF ACCEPTANCE OF SEVEN ITEMS RATED *ESTABLISHED* BY LEONARD AND CRISP AND *LITERARY ENGLISH* OR *AMERICAN LITERARY ENGLISH* BY MARCKWARDT AND WALCOTT

Item	AHD Panel Percentage of Acceptance	Leonard Classification of AHD Panel Votes
as (not as . . . as)	57	Disputable
farther (*further* for physical distance)	20	Illiterate
kind (That kind of buildings seem . . .)	25 (fw)	Illiterate
loan (as verb) [a]	30	Disputable
split infinitive	60	Disputable
were (If it wasn't for football, . .)	19	Illiterate
which (with clause antecedent)	85	Established

[a] Rated as *American Literary English* by Marckwardt and Walcott; all other items were rated as *Literary English*.

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION BY DECILE OF AHD USAGE PANEL VOTES ON THIRTY-SIX ITEMS RATED *ESTABLISHED* IN THE CRISP STUDY

DECILE	1 0-9%	2 10-19%	3 20-29%	4 30-39%	5 40-49%	6 50-59%	7 60-69%	8 70-79%	9 80-89%	10 90-100%
No. of Votes	1	6	7	5	2	6	7	1	4	0

Number of Items Rated by AHD Panel as	*Established*	5
	Disputable	21
	Illiterate	13
	TOTAL	39

Note: Thirty-nine votes are tallied; three items were voted upon as to use both in writing and in speech.

THE USEFULNESS OF THE AHD USAGE PANEL

Many reasons have been suggested for viewing the AHD Usage Panel votes with reservations. The original basis for selection of usage problems for Panel consideration is not clear; the reasons for reporting Panel votes in some cases and for not reporting votes in others, even though they were collected, are not clear; the frames and contexts in which locutions were presented to the Panel often seem carelessly designed; editorial decisions as to method of reporting votes seem at best arbitrary and unmotivated, at worst designed to influence reader reaction to the vote. Most importantly, though, the votes have been seen to summarize a series of individual statements *about* language rather than of observations of actual usage — their own or that of others — by the Usage Panel members.

Others who have assessed the AHD practice have been less than impressed. Marckwardt seems to believe that the AHD method of securing opinions about usage is basically sound and useful but that the application leaves something to be desired. He characterizes the questionnaire approach as used in AHD as "a serious but somewhat uncontrolled effort to determine attitude on the part of a highly selective but unevenly grouped 'population' of a miscellaneously chosen group of items of language usage."[33] He concludes his analysis of AHD by saying of the usage notes,

> Prejudice is scarcely a substitute for fact; it is merely a part of the record along with it. Nevertheless, if the usage notes are read with a sense of their limitations kept in mind, they have a real though restricted value with respect to the particular items to which they are attached. Any broader application would scarcely be justified in the light of a careful study of the operation of the survey and the behavior and judgments of the panel.[34]

In short, Marckwardt thinks that the method has promise but that the AHD application of it is operationally so careless as to render all reported opinions suspect.

A far harsher view of the value of the reported percentages of Panel opinion on usages in the AHD has been expressed by Patrick Kilburn. In his view, the Usage Panel "is only a gimmick, a linguistic guide to pinky-pointing." Further, ". . . the claim that this dictionary is 'more precisely descriptive . . . than any heretofore published' is sheer balderdash; the Usage Notes are 'precisely descriptive' of nothing but the state of the pundits' navels."[35] Kilburn obviously sees merit in neither the method nor the performance.

As part of a broader survey of lexicographical practices, Allen Walker Read comments on a favorable reaction by Archibald Hill[36] to the AHD use of a panel of experts:

> Hill was somewhat impressed by the panel on the ground that it was the use of JURYMEN. The word *jury* is impressive in the history of English jurisprudence, but in linguistic contexts it is a figure of speech that has considerable inaccuracy. This call upon "juries" is a device suitable for a crash program, to finish a work quickly, without the patient and painstaking amassing of a file of evidence that ought to be the basis of a lexicographical project. A scholar with the sophistication of Hill ought to know that sentences ABOUT usage are of an utterly different order from the sentences that exemplify usage. Such materials should be relegated to an Appendix with the title: "How to Maintain your Prestige in American Society by Making Appropriate Statements about Usage." You too can then join the mandarins.[37]

All three of the commentators — Marckwardt, Kilburn, Read — agree that the votes of the Usage Panel "mean" very little in reference to actual usage. Marckwardt is more sanguine than the others about the possibilities of the AHD method of securing information about usage, but all three are united in the view that the apparent objectivity imparted by the reporting of judgments in terms of percentage of approval or disapproval is in fact only apparent — that it is specious. The percentages are really reports of what Morris Bishop in his introductory essay on usage in AHD refers to in saying of the Panelists, "They revealed, often with passion, their likes and dislikes, their principles, and their whims and crotchets."[38]

All the findings of this study support the dark assessments of Kilburn and Read. If usage consists of the passionately felt "likes and dislikes," "whims and crotchets," and even "principles" of 105 largely-American journalists, belletrists, authors, and academicians, then the AHD is indeed "more precisely descriptive" than any other dictionary. If it consists of something more, the AHD is not a reliable guide.

CHAPTER 3

THE TREATMENT OF OTHER DICTIONARIES OF USAGES VOTED UPON BY THE *AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY* USAGE PANEL

In the preceding chapter, a detailed analysis was presented of both the methods and the findings of the *American Heritage Dictionary* in its treatment of usage as exemplified in 226 usage notes in which a vote or votes by the AHD Usage Panel are reported. The results of that analysis serve as a base for the examination of the treatment of those items in nine other modern American dictionaries. The purpose of the examination is to determine and describe the practices followed in the treatment of usage problems in those other dictionaries. AHD choices of items deserving treatment as usage problems and AHD judgments on those items will serve as a temporary bench mark in the examination of practice in other dictionaries. As becomes clear, AHD practices do not represent the enduring and immutable standard ordinarily implied by the term "bench mark." But they serve as a convenient and useful framework for the examination of practices in other dictionaries and usage handbooks.

The method employed in this examination of practice has been to search each of nine additional modern American dictionaries[1] for treatment of or reference to each of the locutions or usages upon which an AHD Panel vote is reported. The additional dictionaries examined in this study are listed below. They are grouped by publisher and arranged in order of publication when there is more than one dictionary by the same publisher. The original copyright date of each edition is shown. If a revision bearing a later copyright date was used as the source of data for this study, the later date appears in parentheses following the original. Abbreviations used for each dictionary are in parentheses at the end of each entry.

G. & C. MERRIAM COMPANY

Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, Second Edition, Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1934 (1959) . (W2)

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1961 (1966) . (W3)

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1963. (WC7)

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1973. (WC8)

RANDOM HOUSE

The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. New York: Random House, Inc., 1966 (1971). (RHD)

The Random House College Dictionary. New York: Random House, Inc., 1968 (1972). (RHCD)

WORLD PUBLISHING COMPANY

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, College Edition. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1953 (1959). (NWD1)

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, Second College Edition. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1970 (1972). (NWD2)

FUNK & WAGNALLS CO., INC.

Funk & Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary, Text Edition. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., Inc., 1963. (SCD)

Some general information about these dictionaries, as well as specific data about each, is germane to this study. The AHD, as pointed out earlier, was selected to supply the basic list of items for study because of its claim of preeminence in providing information about current usage based upon its innovative use of a panel of "experts." The other dictionaries were chosen primarily to provide a broad set of opportunities for comparison and contrast both with the AHD and with each other.

Dates of publication of the dictionaries range from 1934 to 1973, with by far the greater number having been published in the latter half of that period. W2 was published in 1934, NWD1 in 1953; the rest have been published since 1963, two of them – WC8 and NWD2 – subsequent to 1969, the year of publication of AHD. W2 and NWD1 represent an earlier generation of dictionaries, characterized by a calmly assumed and relatively unself-conscious air of authoritativeness much in the tradition of Samuel Johnson and Noah Webster.

The next dictionary published, W3, created a furor which has influenced the treatment of usage in subsequent dictionary publication. Its editors, as has been widely discussed, severely limited the use of restrictive labels and otherwise avoided taking a stand on matters of variant usage. The stated reason for this radical departure in lexicography was that the editors saw their mission to be purely and exclusively the description of the language; it did not include the prescribing of "approved" usages. Instead, they furnished entries with numerous citations, leaving readers to decide whether the citation of a locution as appearing in the published work, author identified, "sanctioned" the usage. Their decision aroused the wrath of a number of older academicians, belletrists, and journalists, who felt that the W3 position represented a dangerous abrogation of authority. The storm over W3, thoroughly documented and discussed in *Dictionaries and That Dictionary*, edited by James Sledd and Wilma R. Ebbitt, influenced treatment of usage or at least editorial statements about usage in all dictionaries published subsequently. Despite editorial assertions, both in advertising matter and in the introductory material to the dictionaries themselves, only the AHD appears to have really increased the number of usages about which questions are raised, and aside from the establishment of the practice of presenting usage notes in marked paragraphs following entries, no real innovations can be discovered. In the characterization of each dictionary which follows, a general outline of claims and an evaluation of practices will be offered. The data supporting these evaluations will be presented in the latter part of the chapter.

The Merriam-Webster Dictionaries

The second edition of the Merriam-Webster *New International Dictionary of the English Language*, W2, had as editor in chief William A. Neilson; Thomas A. Knott served as managing editor. No member of the editorial staff is identified as having been specifically responsible for the assignment of restrictive labels or the inclusion of usage comments in the entries. W2 editors had a file of 1,665,000 citation slips on which to base definitions and usage information. The dictionary has over 600,000 entries, over 550,000 of which are in the main or vocabulary section, the remainder in a Gazeteer (36,000), a Biographical Dictionary (13,000), and a Table of Abbreviations (5,000).[2] The "Introduction" to the dictionary describes W2's attitude toward variant usages.

> The entry, definition, and proper classification of selected non-standard and substandard English words have been greatly extended in the New Edition. Both Samuel Johnson and Noah Webster conceived it to be the duty of the dictionary editor to maintain the purity of the language. However,

> with the growth in literacy in the past century, and the increase, in fiction and drama, in radio and motion picture, of the use of dialect, slang, and colloquial speech, it has become necessary for a general dictionary to record and interpret the vocabularies of geographical and occupational dialects, and of the livelier levels of speech of the educated. The shifting status of many expressions in slang and colloquial speech has made it necessary to review and rejudge the status and validity of all such terms, whether newly collected or contained in former editions of this Dictionary. Slang terms and slang meanings of standard words have been entered only when there is evidence that the slang term has been in use for a considerable length of time, and when it has been used in a printed work which is likely to continue being read. The carefully checked judgment of the editorial staff concerning such terms is expressed in the italic labels *Colloq.*, *Dial.*, *Slang*, etc., appended to the definitions. The Dialect collections of the New Edition have in large part been edited by Dr. Percy W. Long.[3]

W2 gives usage information in three ways: by the use of labels, by the use of comments or notes included in the body of an entry when a sense or senses of the entry word are adjudged in some way questionable, and occasionally by a discussion in a synonymy. No complete list of labels is supplied in the front matter of the dictionary, but subject labels — Agriculture, Botany, Astronomy, etc., geographical labels — United States, British, Scottish, etc., and style or function labels are widely employed in the entries. In the items studied here, the following labels or one-word restriction indicators are used: Following each label in parentheses is an example from the Master List (see pp. 141-87) of an item to which the label is applied by W2: Colloquial (*ain't* [c], *bad* [c]), Dialect (*ain't* [a] [b], *leave* [a]), Erroneous (*upward*), Illiterate (*like*), Informal (*most* [a]), Loosely (*alternative, can* [a-d], *claim*), Obsolete (*tend*), Rare (*consequential, disinterested*), Slang, often with qualifiers as *U.S. Slang* (*contact*), *Racing Slang* (*dope*), *Nautical Slang* (*rate* [a]), Ungrammatical (*who* [c]).

The line between restrictive labels and usage notes is not so clear in W2 as it is in some of the other dictionaries studied. Editorial practice was apparently not highly regularized; a substitute for "loosely," for example, is "sometimes less strictly." A typical W2 usage note, appearing in the body of the entry following the sense designation in question, occurs in the entry for *transpire* "happen": "in this sense has been disapproved by most authorities on usage, although used by many authors of good standing." W2 applies labels to more of the usages with which this study is concerned than does any other dictionary, including the AHD. It includes usage notes of some sort only slightly less frequently than it applies labels.

Evidence that W2 is really a dictionary from an earlier time and no longer as useful to the contemporary user as some of the others is found in the number of items which W2 does not enter and which are entered in all the other dictionaries; a partial list includes *better, bimonthly, cohort, dilemma, insignia* (a, b), *personality,* and *shambles,* in the senses voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel. Some items to which W2 attaches a restrictive label – very often the label is *Colloquial* – and which the other dictionaries list without restriction are *dive, done, oblivious, quiz, someway, through trek,* and *try.* W2 is the most conservative and prescriptive of all the dictionaries studied. This finding is, of course, not at all surprising considering the date of publication. W2 served as the authority on American English usage for nearly thirty years.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, W3, was published in 1961. Philip B. Gove was editor in chief. No specific editorial staff member is identified as having major responsibility for usage labels or notes. In the years since W2 had been published, the Merriam staff had increased from 1,665,000 to 10,000,000 the file of citations on which definitions and usage information are based. The dictionary contains 450,000 entries, all in the main vocabulary. The publishers state in an advertisement bound into the dictionary that there are over 1,000 synonymy paragraphs in which "approximately 5000 commonly confused words are clarified . . . so as to leave no doubt regarding usage in speech and in writing." More important than the synonymies from the point of view of W3's handling of usage are the approximately 200,000 usage examples from 14,000 different authors – authors ranging from Art Linkletter (*like*) to the likes of Truman Capote (*drunk*), Carl Van Doren (*center*), Robert Graves (*deprecate*), Sir Winston Churchill (*kind*), Adlai E. Stevenson (*epithet*), and C. L. Sulzberger (*disinterested*). Many citations are from newspapers and magazines including some which were severely critical of W3; among them are the *New York Times, Springfield (Mass.) Republican, Publisher's Weekly, Harper's, Newsweek, The New Republic, Saturday Review,* and many others.

The editors of W3 counted on the inclusion of this large number of citations from both well-known and not-so-well-known authors and publications to take the place of a severely curtailed use of restrictive labels: The "verbal illustrations," as they are called in the front matter, were included

> . . . with a view to contributing to the user's interest and understanding by showing a word used in context. The illustration is often a brief combination of words that has actually been used in writing and when this is so the illustration is attributed to its author or source. More than 14,000 different authors are quoted for their use of words or for the structural pattern of their words but not for their opinions or sentiments.[4]

Again and again in the Preface Gove reiterates the conviction that the lexicographer's duty is to record the language as it is used, not to rule on its appropriateness. "In conformity with the principle that a definition, to be adequate, must be written only after an analysis of usage, the definitions in this edition are based chiefly on examples of usage collected since publication of the preceding edition." Further on, he writes, ". . . prescriptive and canonical definitions have not been taken nor have recommendations [from specialists] been followed unless confirmed by independent investigation of usage borne out by genuine citations." Again, "Accuracy . . . requires a dictionary to state meanings in which words are in fact used, not to give editorial opinion on what their meanings should be."[5]

Restrictive labels are applied in W3, as in W2, on the basis of editorial judgment of the contexts in which instances of word use appear. The label widely used in W2, *Colloquial*, is not used in W3 because, according to Gove ". . . it is impossible to know whether a word out of context is colloquial or not. . . ."[6] There is, similarly, and, for some strange reason, the absence is not often commented upon, no use of the label *Informal*. Only three stylistic or status labels are used in W3 – *Slang*, "affixed to terms especially appropriate in contexts of extreme informality . . . ," *Substandard*, ". . . differs in choice of word or form from that of the prestige group . . . ," and *Nonstandard*, "words that can hardly stand without some status label but are too widely current in reputable context to be labeled *substandard*." Temporal labels – *Obsolete* and *Archaic* – and regional labels – *Dialect* along with indication of that part of the United States or of the British Commonwealth in which the sense is current – are also used.

Subject labels are few, with the definition often including the information about the area of application of a sense, and what are called in W3 "functional labels," notations such as "pl. but sing. or pl. in cst." or "usu. cap."

W3 and the two abridgements developed from it, WC7 and WC8, are, as measured by their use of restrictive labels, far and away the most nonprescriptive of all the dictionaries studied. Of the 318 usages on which an AHD Usage Panel vote is reported, W3 applies a stylistic or status label to only 6: *Nonstandard* is not applied to any of the 318; *Substandard* is applied to 3 – *bad* (c), and *leave* (a, b); and *Slang* to 3 – *bug* (a, b), and *dope* (b). Very often W3 supplies citations from established authors or from prestigious publications to provide tacit support for its non-assignment of restrictive labels to widely discussed items of variant usage. Such citations, often two or three, sometimes more, per entry, are supplied for 103 of the 318 items studied here. In addition to citations – actual quotations from published authors – verbal examples prepared by the editors are sometimes supplied. Although the sample contexts supplied are often very helpful and illuminating, critics of W3, and even many of those who in general admire it, feel that the lack of labeling or other indications of restriction upon use of some locutions is a weakness in the dictionary. Weakness it may be, to a public seeking authoritative direction about language, but the scholarly integrity of W3 stands as a monument to the depth of the editors' conviction that usage, not appeals to logic or analogy or authority, is the true determiner of language "correctness."

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, WC7, published in 1963, and *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, WC8, published in 1973, can conveniently be discussed together, as they represent successive abridgements of W3. WC7 was produced while Philip B. Gove was still editor in chief; H. Bosley Woolf served as managing editor. WC8 was produced with Woolf as editor in chief; Gove, having retired, served as an editorial consultant. WC7 claims, on its cover, 130,000 entries, 10,000 usage examples, 4,700 usage labels, and 750 synonym paragraphs covering more than 3,400 related words. WC8 claims a larger number of entries – 150,000, and almost triple the number of usage examples of WC7 -- 27,000; it claims 760 synonym paragraphs, an increase of 10 over WC7. The cover of WC8 indicates that the Merriam citation file has grown by a million and a half since the 1961 publication of W3, to eleven and one-half million slips. Interestingly, no claim is made about the number of usage labels in WC8. Apparently the sting of the storm of criticism of W3 has diminished somewhat. Much is made, however, of a free service to all WC8 purchasers which will "answer any questions, large or small, about words and their usage."

The status labels used in WC7 and WC8 are the same as those in W3. Indeed the explanation of the meanings of these labels is verbatim in WC7 and almost so in WC8. Only one item of the 318 voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel is labeled in WC7 – *gift* in its use as a verb is labeled *Chiefly British*. WC8 carries the stinting of the use of labels to its logical final state; not one of the 318 usages studied bears a restrictive label. Unfortunately, one of the losses incurred in abridgement involves citations. Although both WC7 and WC8 contain citations, WC8 far more than WC7, neither approaches the richness of W3 in this resource.

A paragraph from *A New Guide to Dictionary Use*, a pamphlet prepared to introduce students to the use of WC7, states quite unequivocally the lexicographical position underlying treatment of variant usage in W3, WC7, and WC8:

> Because the words we use are called upon to meet an infinite and often unpredictable variety of communication situations, it is virtually impossible for a dictionary to apply status labels with honest realism or with any useful degree of consistency. As a guide to usage the best dictionary is the one that applies such restrictive labeling the least. In selecting words to use in your own writing or in preparing talks, you should preferably use only those which come naturally to you and which your own experience assures you to be in acceptable style and taste. Any word you look up in the Seventh New Collegiate, as a writer or speaker rather than as a reader or listener, should be carefully weighed in the light of the following usage devices the book provides: (a) labels, (b) verbal illustrations, (c) usage notes, (d) content and style of definitions, and (e) the synonymous cross-reference, which takes the consulter to a more central or common core meaning. . . .[7]

In short, these dictionaries describe and, where deemed necessary and possible, provide the evidence on which the description is based.

The Random House Dictionaries

The Random House Dictionary of the English Language

(RHD) was published in 1966, five years after the storm over W3. Jess Stein, as editor in chief, and Laurence Urdang, as managing editor, brought out the first "new" dictionary produced after adequate time had elapsed to estimate the lexicographical and commercial impact of the criticisms of W3. Two years later, an abridgement of RHD, *The Random House College Dictionary* (RHCD), appeared, with Laurence Urdang as editor in chief and Stuart Berg Flexner, who had earlier co-edited (with Harold Wentworth) the *Dictionary of American Slang*,[8] as managing editor. In RHD, Raven I. McDavid, Jr. was credited with having led a panel of linguists who reviewed usage labels, and Theodore M. Bernstein as having prepared usage notes. In RHCD, although both are listed as consultants in the areas indicated, no indication is given that they were in any way *responsible* for those two aspects. Although the RHD contained only 260,000 entries, it was billed by Random House as an unabridged dictionary; the RHCD claimed 155,000 entries – about the number included in most "college" or desk dictionaries. The 10,000 synonym lists and studies claimed by RHD are reduced to 5,000 in the advertising for RHCD. RHD claims 50,000 example phrases and sentences, RHCD 38,000. These example phrases and sentences were almost all editorially produced. They are not, as is the case in the Merriam-Webster dictionaries, citations from actual published usage. RHD has nowhere made – at least I have not come across – a claim as to how many usage and field labels it uses in the entries; RHCD claims to use 38,000.

In the "Guide to the Dictionary," RHD lists only examples of the restrictive labels employed: "*U.S., Brit.* etc.; *Archaic, Obs.*; *Physics, Chem., Slang, Informal.*"[9] In practice, the variety of labels is fairly extensive. One additional status label is employed – *Nonstandard* – nowhere defined or mentioned in the front matter, and one additional term, *loosely*, is occasionally employed, not exactly a status label, but suggestive of a restriction on the use of the words in the senses so labeled. RHCD uses the same set of labels as RHD. In addition to labels, both RHD and RHCD contain a significant number of usage notes, separated from the body of the entry when they occur and indicated by the label *Usage*. This practice is not original with RHD and RHCD; as we shall see, the *Standard College Dictionary*, the first dictionary published after the W3 storm, had introduced the practice, designating the separate usage notes following the entry by a typographical device similar to a diamond.

The RHD-RHCD position on usage is expressed in the following excerpt from the Preface to RHD, signed by Jess Stein:

> And finally, that lexicographer's Scylla and Charybdis: Should the dictionary be an authoritarian guide to "correct" English or should it be so antiseptically free of comment that it may defeat the user by providing him with no guidance at all? There is, we believe, a linguistically sound middle course. Language, most people agree, is never static—except when dead. It has a capacity for constant change and growth that enables it to serve effectively the requirements of the society in which it exists. It is, therefore, the function of a dictionary to provide its user with an exact record of the language he sees and hears. That record must be *fully* descriptive. Since language is a social institution, the lexicographer must give the user an adequate indication of the attitudes of society toward particular words or expressions, whether he regards those attitudes as linguistically sound or not. The lexicographer who does not recognize the existence of long-established strictures in usage has not discharged his full responsibility. He has not been objective and factual; he has reported selectively, omitting references to a social attitude relevant to many words and expressions. He does not need to express approval or disapproval of a disputed usage, but he does need to report the milieu of words as well as their meanings. In this dictionary, on the basis of extensive research and thoughtful consideration, we have used usage labels to guide the reader to effective and appropriate use of words. A special panel of linguists, under Professor Raven I. McDavid, Jr., has reviewed and, where necessary, amended the usage labels throughout the RHD.
>
> In addition, to answer some of the frequently troublesome questions of usage, we have often appended to an entry a brief usage note. These usage notes are not arbitrary personal judgments; they are reports of the do's and don'ts urged by many users of English. The notes were prepared under the able direction of Mr. Theodore M. Bernstein of *The New York Times* and then reviewed by a group of editors and teachers.[10]

Some rather curious variations occur in the treatment of specific items by RHD and RHCD. As might be expected when an abridgement is made, some usage notes appearing in RHD do not appear in RHCD; such is the case with *alibi, bit, contact, mutual,* and *so* (b). But there are also a few cases in which there is a note in RHCD and none in RHD – *anxious, enormity, presently* (b). Also, in a number of instances a note appearing in RHD is shortened in RHCD – *blame, good, like, only, participle* (c), and *shall.* This shortening, obviously designed to conserve space, in several cases makes it appear that the two dictionaries are in disagreement. The note at *blame,* for instance, in RHD reads as follows.

> Some speakers avoid *blame on* as informal, preferring *blame* alone or *blame for*. Since all three forms occur with equal frequency there is no need to regard any one form as less acceptable.

In RHCD the note appears minus its second sentence, leaving only the impression that there *is* something wrong with *blame on*. Much the same sort of effect is produced by the omission of a long sentence in the RHCD note at *only*.

A final point remains to be made concerning the source of RHD judgments about usage. Although Jess Stein in the Preface credits decisions on usage notes to Theodore Bernstein, indicating that they were "reviewed" by a panel of "editors and teachers," it would appear that quite a few of the notes do not represent Bernstein's position at all; in fact, they take a position counter to his. Checking the first three letters of the alphabet in the Master List turns up three items in which the RHD note flatly disagrees with Bernstein's position as taken in *The Careful Writer*, to be discussed in the next chapter: *blame, cannot, consensus*. Personal communication from Raven I. McDavid, Jr. and the other members of his panel of experts on application of labels, William Card and Virginia Glenn McDavid, indicate that, although their recommendations on individual items were sometimes accepted, they sometimes were not; the only conclusion to be drawn is that, despite Stein's statement in the Preface, Random House editors were the final arbiters of usage.

In general, the RHD-RHCD position on usage is that attitudes about a locution are really more important than use of that locution by reputable speakers and writers. The note at *enthuse* in the two dictionaries is a good example.

> Although it is too widely encountered in the speech and writing of reputable teachers and authors to be listed as anything short of standard, ENTHUSE is nevertheless felt by many to be poor style, and in formal writing it would be best to paraphrase it.

The message is, "Even though this usage is standard English, do not use it, because many [translate 'a few'] do not like it." The Random House dictionaries fall slightly short of being the most conservative and prescriptive of the recently published dictionaries. They are exceeded in these qualities by the last dictionary to be discussed, the *Standard College Dictionary*.

As in a number of cases in which the editors of a dictionary have engaged a scholar of language to provide general information about usage as part of the dictionary front matter, the editors of RHD appear to have ignored the warning implicit in the essay "Usage, Dialects, and Functional Varieties" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.

> Although actually there are subtle distinctions in usage which will determine the appropriateness of a given form on a particular occasion, and which can be appreciated only by long observation and intuitive experience, the prevailing public attitude is that certain forms of usage are "correct" and others are "incorrect." . . . Entrepreneurs who make fortunes out of public anxieties stand ready to provide what the schools haven't given, by warning against "common mistakes" in the language of even the best educated.[11]

THE WORLD DICTIONARIES

The "desk size" dictionaries published by the World Publishing Company are abridgements of a larger "encyclopedic" dictionary. The first edition of Webster's *New World Dictionary of the American Language*, College Edition, was published in 1953 under the joint editorship of Joseph H. Friend and David B. Guralnik. The second College Edition was published in 1970 with Guralnik as editor in chief. Promotional material on the two dictionaries is not as statistic-filled as that of the other dictionaries studied. NWD1 claims "over 140,000 words with all the important idiomatic expressions, the colloquialisms, and the slang," and asserts that it contains "more descriptive synonymies than any other book of its scope." NWD2 claims over 157,000 entries, including 12,000 items identified as Americanisms, "those words or meanings which first became part of the language in the United States." Mitford M. Mathews, compiler of the *Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles*, is listed as Special Consulting Editor and Editor, Americanisms, in the editorial staff listing for NWD2.

The cover copy for NWD1 says, "It is a dictionary that recognizes its function to be that of description, not prohibition. It records actual usage; it does not assume the role of authoritarian lawgiver." NWD1, like W2, was published in the pre-W3 era, when it was possible for a dictionary to be authoritarian without any feeling of need to justify that authoritarianism, yet it pays at least lip service to the principle of non-prescriptivism.

NWD2's position on usage is more forthright. In the Foreword to the dictionary, the editor writes,

> The art of the lexicographer is further displayed in the help that is given the user of the dictionary who must decide the aptness of any term or phrase to the use he wishes to make of it. The editors of this work believe that one who consults a college dictionary is entitled to the informed collective determination by the staff as to whether a particular term is appropriate to a standard or formal context or is suitable only in an informal context or as an item of slang, whether a given word is current or obsolete or archaic or now rare, whether it is current only as a regional, or dialectal term, and whether it is, in spite of widespread usage, held in low repute by those who take a stricter, or purist, view of these matters. The issue is not one of "permissiveness" versus "authoritarianism." No lexicographer, at least in this country, has been given a mandate either to permit or to disallow any usage. He has, however, assumed the responsibility of informing the public of the state of the language as of the time during which his dictionary was being compiled. The status of any usage, as determined by the trained lexicographer after a careful study of current writings and speech and disregarding the crotchets and prejudices of individuals, is a part of the record and should be incorporated among the data made available to the writer and student.[12]

Nowhere is any explanation offered of the difference between an item's being "held in low repute by those who take a stricter, or purist, view of these matters" and "the crotchets and prejudices of individuals" mentioned near the end of the paragraph.

Only two status or stylistic labels are used in NWD1 and NWD2. The definitions reflect conventional lexicographic practice. "*Colloquial*: The term or sense is generally characteristic of conversation and informal writing." "*Slang*: The term or sense is not generally regarded as standard usage but is used, even by the best speakers, in occasional, highly informal contexts. . . ." Other labels include *Obsolete, Archaic, Dialect,* the troublesome *Poetic,* and a few additional geographic labels. *Dialect* is properly restricted to the designation of terms used in limited geographical areas.

Just as the essay by Raven I. McDavid, Jr., in the front matter of RHD and RHCD, "Usage, Dialects, and Functional Varieties," in its sound good sense highlighted by contrast the arbitrariness of the usage judgments often made by the staff of the Random House dictionaries, so does that by Charlton Laird in NWD2. In his essay, entitled "Language and the Dictionary," Laird says, "To date, nobody has been able to devise language labels that will be at once objective and permanent"; and, a little later on, ". . . usage is not very sharply measurable and is much too subtle to be measured satisfactorily with a few usage labels."[13] His final generalization about usage labels, however, reveals the compromise with public expectations and commercial reality which always seems to prevail in the end:

> Users of dictionaries want usage labels and with good reason. The public mostly trusts such labels too much, but, however unscientific usage labels may be, they provide the only succinct means yet devised, handy for both the maker and user of the dictionary, with which a speaker or writer can be quickly warned about the limited usage of a word, and can be given some indication of the limits. . . .[14]

NWD1 and 2 stand rather high, in comparison to other modern dictionaries, in their use of labels on the 318 items studied here. NWD1 applies labels to 66 items, NWD2 to 49. Often the labels, as well as the brief usage notes appearing as part of the entries, are the same in NWD2 or in NWD1. Together, the two dictionaries represent a sort of middle ground in indicating restrictions on locutions, the large number of usage labels being counterbalanced by the relatively small number of usage notes.

The inclusion in NWD2 of an indication of an American origin for certain words or senses of words raises an interesting question about a possible "reason" for the low repute of some items of usage. There is not enough evidence here to merit lengthy discussion, but what is available is sufficiently intriguing to be mentioned briefly. Nearly 12 percent of the items on which an AHD Usage Panel vote is reported are designated as Americanisms in NWD2. Table 14 lists the thirty-seven different words or senses so labeled. The cover copy for NWD2, as has been mentioned, claims that more than 12,000 items are identified as "words or meanings which first became part of the language in the United States." Assuming, conservatively, I believe, that there is an average of two senses per entry, the 157,000 entries in NWD2 would produce 314,000 senses. This would mean that slightly less than 4 percent of all the senses in the dictionary are of American origin (probably a high figure). The fact that three times that percentage occur on the list of items about which AHD raises usage questions seems to suggest that American origin is a liability for an expression attempting to gain acceptance by the "experts." Without further examination of this possibility, and without a larger body of data, no conclusion can be drawn, but, in the search to determine motivations underlying the development of animadversions, the possibility that native origin may be one source cannot be ignored.

The Funk and Wagnalls Dictionary

The last of the dictionaries included in this study, the *Standard College Dictionary*, was published in 1963, with Robert L. Chapman and Ramona R. Michaelis as supervising editors. A Supervisory Board of language scholars, however, assumed major responsibility for certain aspects of the dictionary, including the application of restrictive labels. Albert H. Marckwardt was chairman of the board and etymologist; Frederick G. Cassidy took responsibility for the application of usage labels, S. I. Hayakawa for synonyms and antonyms and James B. McMillan for pronunciation. Above their names in the front matter appears the following statement: "The members of the board reviewed and assumed responsibility for all of the dictionary material in the fields of specialization indicated below." What this arrangement appears to mean is that a resident staff at Funk and Wagnalls prepared the dictionary entries and submitted them to the supervisory board for approval. No doubt, entries, including usage labels,

TABLE 14

WORDS OR SENSES LABELED *AMERICANISM* IN NWD2 ON WHICH AN AHD USAGE PANEL VOTE IS REPORTED

Number of words or senses = 37

alibi n
alibi vi
back (of)
(in) back (of)
bit
blame
bug n
bug v
buy
claim
contact v
contact n
dope n
dope v
dropout
due (to)
enthuse vi
enthuse vt
escalate vi
escalate vt
finalize
OK
quite (a few)
quiz vt
quiz n
raise n
rambunctious
rattle
rendition
scan
shakedown n
shake down v
spell
straddle vt
straddle vi
transpire
tycoon

were prepared according to supervisory board instructions.

The cover copy of SCD claims over 150,000 entries, about average for a desk dictionary. It also claims "extensive use of restrictive labels, indicating usage levels, dialect distribution." It seems clear that the publishers had listened carefully to the criticism of W3. In addition, the dictionary furnishes "special notes on grammar and usage (some 260 in number, over 25,000 words – a miniature handbook of English)." SCD, as has been mentioned above, is the innovator of the practice, later followed by RHD, RHCD, and AHD, of placing usage notes in a separate, marked paragraph following the entry which defines the word or phrase in question. SCD marks usage notes with a diamond-shaped typographical device.

The section of the "Plan" of the dictionary dealing with restrictive labels is signed by Frederic G. Cassidy.[15] Cassidy divides the labels in two ways – by level and by style. His analysis into levels follows:

Standard English	Throughout the English-speaking world (No label)
	Characteristic of a national division of English: Labels: *U.S., Brit., Scot., Austral.,* etc.
	Characteristic of a broad region of a national division Labels: *Southern U.S., SW U.S.,* etc.
	Characteristic of general informal use Label: *Informal*
Nonstandard English	Used within a small geographical area, and often rural and traditional Label: *Dial.*
	Used to express a humorous, racy, and irreverent attitude, often within a particular group Label: *Slang*
	Used within a group in connection with a common activity, trade, or profession (No label or field label)
	Used by the least educated, and considered incorrect by most users of Standard English Label: *Illit.*

He points out that two distinct styles, formal and informal, are recognized, and, in a footnote says, "The label *Colloq.* . . . is now so widely misunderstood by the public as to be no longer serviceable and is therefore not used in this dictionary." The definitions of formal and informal style are sensible:

> Formal style is that appropriate to all public and serious expression: to spoken use in legislative assemblies, in courts, in the pulpit; to "belles lettres" or artistic literature; to legal and scientific writing. Because its users tend to be the cultivated and literate part of the public, it tends to be more deliberate, precise, discriminating, and orderly than the casual usage normal to everyday discourse, even that carried on by the same cultivated group.
>
> Informal style, that employed by most people a great part of the time in both speaking and writing, differs from the formal in being less consciously controlled, less precise, less complex and compact, less careful in diction—though quite acceptable within its sphere, and more appropriate to relaxed situations than formal style would be.

Distinctions of style, he says, "are partly esthetic and subjective." In addition to style and level indicators, SCD has the normal currency labels, locality labels, field labels, and foreign language labels.

The section headed "Usage Notes"[16] in the "Plan" of the SCD is not attributed to any member of the supervisory board. It is brief enough to quote in its entirety:

> Special points of grammar and idiom, when essential to correct usage, are included, following a colon, after the particular sense of a word to which they apply. More extensive notes consisting of supplementary information on grammar, accepted usage, the relative status of variant forms, etc., are entered at the end of the relevant entries and prefaced with the symbol ◆.

All of the notes relevant to the usages researched in this study were of the latter variety, not included in the body of the entry.

Fifty-two of the 318 usages voted on in AHD are labeled in SCD, 80 of the usages are the subjects of marked usage notes, and 12 are both labeled and discussed in notes. SCD uses the greatest number of labels of all the dictionaries studied except W2 and NWD1, the two older dictionaries, and the greatest number of usage notes of all except, of course, the AHD. After AHD, SCD is the most conservative and prescriptive of all the post-W3 dictionaries.

Analysis of Treatment in Nine Dictionaries of 318 Usages Voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel

Virginia McDavid, in her report, "Variations in Dictionary Labeling,"[17] reported a significant disparity in the labels applied to 88 items studied in a smaller number of dictionaries (WC7, SCD, RHCD, AHD, NWD2) than analyzed here. In her study, which suggested the present broader scale study, she found that on more than one-half the items, the handling by dictionaries was "roughly comparable." In the remainder of cases, there was no consistency of treatment. In the extreme case, one dictionary might not even enter the item in question, two would define it with no restriction, and two would apply a restrictive label of some type. The present study finds even less consistency in treatment by dictionaries of the 318 items studied, quite possibly because the sample of usages studied is the result of demonstratedly idiosyncratic choices by AHD editors, and because this study includes both older and more recent, both unabridged and abridged dictionaries.

On only two of the 318 items considered here are all dictionaries in agreement that their use should be restricted. Not surprisingly, the items are *ain't* (a) "Ain't I?" and *ain't* (b) "It *ain't* likely." However, this "agreement" finds highly diverse forms of expression in the various dictionaries. *Ain't* (a) is treated as follows: W2 labels it *Dial. or Illit.*; W3, WC7, and WC8, in notes, limit its use to informal speech; RHD and RHCD label it *Nonstand. U.S., Informal Brit.*, and warn against its use in a note; NWD1 and 2 label it *Colloq.* and discuss it in a note, indicating that it is criticized by some, defended by others, and taking no stand on the issue; finally, SCD labels it *Illit and Dial.* and characterizes it in a note as nonstandard. The range of labels and pronouncements is about the same for *ain't* (b): W2 and SCD label it *Dial. or Illit.*; W3, WC7, and WC8 treat it the same as *ain't* (a); RHD and RHCD label it *Nonstandard*; NWD1 and 2 label it *Dial or Substd.* It is ironic that the treatment of *ain't* (a and b) in these nine dictionaries, the only two instances in which all agree with each other and with AHD in indicating restricted use, demonstrates such a sweeping lack of agreement in labeling practice. If this were the only case in which this phenomenon were discovered, the diversity might be dismissed as an understandable variation in editorial practice, with the apparently different labels actually being synonymous. Analysis of all 318 AHD-chosen usages, however, does not support this charitable conclusion.

With practices in the use of labels and notes and in the meanings assigned to labels differing as much as they do from dictionary to dictionary, it is extremely difficult to draw comparisons.

Dictionaries indicate restrictions on word use in at least four ways: through application of a restrictive label, through a usage note, through discrimination in a synonymy, and through verbal illustration or citation. The use of all four of these techniques has already been described in discussions of the nine dictionaries. So that meaningful comparisons among dictionaries can be made, in the following discussion and tabulations, treatment of an item by a dictionary is classified in one of the following categories: *Not Treated* (N), *Accepted* (A), *Restricted* (R). Placement in the first category, *Not Treated*, means that a locution is not entered, defined, listed, or referred to in the dictionary in question; the word in question may occur as an entry word, but the specific usage problem treated in the AHD is not treated in that entry or elsewhere. *Accepted* means that the item is entered, with no indication of restriction or possible restriction, or is discussed (in the entry or in a separate note or synonymy) and pronounced acceptable for use in all styles and at all levels, without restriction. *Restricted* means that the item is either labeled or discussed in a note or synonymy indicating disapproval of use or some limitation on use. All instances of status or stylistic labeling and geographic labeling are placed in this category.

As the only two instances in which the nine dictionaries are unanimous in restricting an item have already been discussed, in the discussions which follow, items will be discussed in six of the seven possible groups encountered in the analysis: (1) items *Not Treated* in any of the nine dictionaries; (2) items *Accepted* in all nine dictionaries; (3) items which are either *Not Treated* or *Accepted* in the nine dictionaries (these items are *Accepted* by all the dictionaries which treat of them, but not all of the nine dictionaries treat them); (4) items which are either *Not Treated* or are *Restricted* in nine dictionaries (again, *Restricted* in all dictionaries which list them, but not all dictionaries refer to or treat them); (5) items which are either *Accepted* or *Restricted* in nine dictionaries (treated in all nine dictionaries, but opinion as to acceptability divided); (6) items which fall into all three classifications — *Not Treated, Accepted, Restricted.* Table 15 gives the number of items which fall into each of the above groups.

TABLE 15

318 AHD ITEMS CLASSIFIED AS TO TREATMENT IN NINE OTHER DICTIONARIES

CLASSIFICATION[a]	NUMBER OF ITEMS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Not Treated (N)	21	7
Accepted (A)	29	9
Restricted (R)	2	.5
Either Not Treated or Accepted (N/A)	68	21
Either Not Treated or Restricted (N/R)	19	6
Either Accepted or Restricted (A/R)	77	24
Either Not Treated, Accepted, or Restricted (N/A/R)	102	32
TOTAL	318	

[a] Classifications are described on p. 71.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the data in Table 15 is that there is a very low level of unanimity among the dictionaries studied. Only 16.5 percent of the 318 items are placed in the same category (either Not Treated or Accepted or Restricted) in all nine dictionaries. At the other end of the scale, just about double that number, or 32 percent are spread across all three categories (Not Treated/Accepted/Restricted) in the nine dictionaries. The remainder, slightly over 50 percent, fall in some combination of two categories (Not Treated/Accepted, Not Treated/Restricted, or Accepted/Restricted). When these data are combined with the AHD Usage Panel votes on the items in question, the complexity of disparity of opinion or judgment among dictionaries becomes even greater.

Table 16 lists the 21 items *Not Treated* by all nine dictionaries. As can be seen, AHD Usage Panel acceptance votes on these 21 items range from 0 to 87 percent. Almost one-half the items *Not Treated* in the nine dictionaries are, not surprisingly, problems of grammar; nine involve diction and two idiom. Three items – *anyone, important,* and *leave* (b) – not only are

TABLE 16

USAGES *NOT TREATED* BY NINE DICTIONARIES[a]

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY[b]
any	33	Gs
anyone #	36	Gs
certain	83	Dw
complete	67	Dw
double negative	71	Gs
each (b)	69	Gs
equal (a)	71	Dw
(b)	37	Dr
escape	26	Iv
follow	22	Gs
important #	50	Ga
leave (b) #	81w	Dc
materialize	33	Dc
noun	23-87	Gs
participle (a)	"substantial	Gs
(b)	majority"	Gs
raise (b)	48	Dc
rarely	13w,38s	Dr
regard	16	Dc
simultaneous	00	Ga
suffer	06	Iv
Total Number of Items = 21		

[a] For definition of terms *Not Treated, Accepted, Restricted,* see p. 71.

[b] For key to symbols, see Table 1, p. 23.

# Items followed by this symbol were also dealt with by none of the usage guides and studies analyzed in this study. They are unique to AHD.

Note: No items in this list were *Accepted* or *Restricted* by any of the dictionaries. No dictionary entered any item on this list in the sense in question.

Not Treated in all nine dictionaries, but also are not to be found in any of the ten usage guides and studies to be discussed in the next chapter. They are, in other words, unique to AHD. As will be seen, these are not the only items which only the AHD editors and Usage Panel are discriminating enough to single out for attention.

In the category *Accepted,* as shown in Table 17, there are 29 items on which all nine dictionaries other than AHD agree. AHD Panel acceptance votes for these items range from 10 to 90 percent. The four items in this list which received the lowest percentages of AHD Panel acceptance are *quick* (10 percent), *outside* (16 percent), *prove* (27 percent), and *loan* (30 percent). All nine dictionaries indicate *no* restriction on these usages, suggesting that AHD editors and Panel members either know something about the social impact of these usages which has eluded the combined expertise of all the editors and consultants of the other nine dictionaries, including the revered W2, or that the votes represent group crotchets peculiar to AHD Panel members.

At the other end of the scale, the four usages in this list which receive the highest percentages of AHD Panel acceptance are *groom* (90 percent), *mutual* (a and b) (86, 83 percent), and *agenda* (a) (86 percent). That these items, and others receiving high percentages of AHD Panel acceptance, are *Accepted* by all nine other dictionaries suggests, as does other evidence mentioned in the preceding chapter, that, far from demonstrating that AHD Panel members are "liberal" or "permissive" in their judgments on some items, the items themselves are really "non-problems."

The "combination" category of items either *Not Treated* or *Accepted* and the other three "combination" categories discussed below are important in demonstrating even more strikingly the range of variability among the nine dictionaries in their judgments of items and the apparent low level of correlation of those treatments with any variable, either dealt with in this study or not treated by it, which I have been able to discover. The 67 items in Table 18 have AHD Panel acceptance votes ranging from 3 to 96 percent. It will be noted in studying Table 18 that every possible numerical combination of dictionary treatment of the items occurs, ranging from one dictionary not treating an item and eight accepting it to eight not treating and one accepting. No correlation appears when items which, for instance, eight of the nine dictionaries accept are isolated and examined: *author, behalf, better, bid, cohort, dilemma, gauntlet, insignia* (a,b), *personality, practically* (a), *raise* (c), *rendition, shambles,* and *sustain.* Those 15 items, *Accepted* in eight of the nine dictionaries, have AHD Panel acceptance votes ranging from 19

TABLE 17

USAGES *ACCEPTED* BY NINE DICTIONARIES[a]

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY[b]
above (a)	72	Fs
(b)	44	Fs
advise	70	Dx
agenda (a)	86	Gn
anticipate	62	Dx
appreciate	47	Dx
between (a)	70	Dx
cannot	68	Gs
contact (b)	61	Dx
data	50	Gn
discomfit	80	Dc
flammable	61	Dc
groom	90	Dx
interpretative	70	Dc
intrigue	52	Dx
loan	30fw	Dc
mutual (a)	86	Dc
(b)	83	Dc
none	68	Gs
normalcy	41w	Fd
oblivious	53	Ip
outside	16	Ip
over	63	Dx
presently (a)	73	Dx
prove	27	Gv
provided	36	Im
quick	10	Ga
viewpoint	76f	Da
whose	74	Gp
Total Number of Items = 29		

[a] For definition of terms *Not Treated, Accepted, Restricted,* see p. 71.

[b] For key to symbols, see Table 1, p. 23.

Note: No items in this list were *Not Treated* or *Restricted* by any of the nine dictionaries. All nine dictionaries *Accepted* all items on this list.

TABLE 18

USAGES EITHER *NOT TREATED* OR *ACCEPTED* BY NINE DICTIONARIES[a]

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY[b]	N/A
about	40fw	Im	7/2
agenda (b)	59	Gn	2/7
all	39	Im	7/2
as	57	Gs	3/6
author	19	Fs	1/8
bad (b)	39w,55s	Ga	3/6
behalf	42	Ip	1/8
better	31	Dx	1/8
bid	82	Dx	1/8
burgeon	49	Dx	2/7
bus (a)	48w	Fs	3/6
but (b)	34w	Gs	4/5
celebrant	51	Dx	2/7
cohort	31	Dx	1/8
commentate	09/19	Fb	4/5
compensate	Dx	3/675	
consensus	31	Dr	4/5
cope	25fw	Iv	2/7
debut	07/03	Fs	5/4
definite	71	Dx	6/3
deprecate	52	Dc	3/6
develop	67	Dx	8/1
dilemma	21	Dx	1/8
doubt (a)	42	Im	8/1
(b)	42	Im	8/1
escalate	75	Fb	3/6
foremost	76	Dx	8/1
fortuitous	15	Dc	3/6
gambit	63	Dx	2/7
gauntlet	77	Dc	1/8
graduate (a)	77	Im	4/5
identify (b)	57	Im	4/5
insignia (a)	73	Gn	1/8
(b)	56	Gn	1/8
lack	42	Iv	6/3
medium (a)	10w,12s	Gn	5/4
(b)	10	Gn	7/2
most (b)	86w,96s	Dx	2/7
myself (b)	"strongly condemn"	Gp	7/2
nicely	68	Dx	7/2
one (a)	08	Gs	8/1
(b)	42	Gs	8/1
personality	43fw	Dx	1/8
practically (a)	51	Dx	1/8
(b)	46	Dx	8/1
premiere	14	Fs	3/6
proportion	65	Dx	2/7
raise (c)	91	Dc	1/8
rendition	69	Dx	1/8
replica	60	Dx	7/2
responsible	70	Dx	6/3
saving	11	Gn	8/1
seem	51w	Im	7/2
shambles	85w	Dx	1/8
sick (a)	"slight pref."	Ip	6/3
sometime	30	Dx	8/1
sound	87	Dx	3/6
spiral	78	Dx	5/4
sustain	56	Dx	1/8
this	28	Dc	8/1
though	39fw	Gs	4/5
truculent	86	Dx	3/6
upcoming	29w	Dx	3/6
which	85	Gs	2/7
why	35	Dr	3/6
zoom (a)	64	Dx	4/5
(b)	31	Dx	4/5

Total Number of Items = 67

---

[a] For definition of terms *Not Treated, Accepted, Restricted,* see p. 71.

[b] For key to symbols, see Table 1, p. 23.

Note: No items in this list were *Restricted* by any of the nine dictionaries. For each item, the number of dictionaries *Not Treating* (N) and the number of dictionaries *Accepting* (A) is shown. Figures are separated by a slash.

percent (*author*), to 91 percent (*raise* [c]). No pattern or relationship can be found between AHD Panel votes and the near-unanimity of acceptance by nine other dictionaries. Although AHD Panel acceptance votes are generally lower for those items *Accepted* by one dictionary and *Not Treated* by eight, the votes still range from 0 to 76 percent and present only a random pattern. Occurrences of *Not Treated* and *Accepted* classification are nearly equal in Table 18. The number of possible occurrences of sixty-eight items in nine dictionaries is 68 x 9 or 612; 270 of those possibilities, or 44 percent, are *Not Treated*; 342, or 56 percent, are *Accepted*.

A much smaller number of items, only 19, falls in the "combination" category *Not Treated/Restricted* as shown in Table 19. AHD Panel votes on these items range from 1 to 76 percent, with the midpoint falling at about 25 percent; this suggests a correlation between low level of AHD Panel acceptance and low level of acceptance by other dictionaries. The correlation disappears, however, upon examination of the data. In 63 percent of the possible cases in this table, the item is *Not Treated*; only in 37 percent of the cases does an item receive a *Restricted* rating. No item in this list is *Restricted* by as many as eight dictionaries; only two items are *Restricted* in seven dictionaries. By way of contrast, five items are *Not Treated* by eight dictionaries, and one item by seven. Although the locutions in this list received generally low votes from the AHD Panel, the other dictionaries are far from unanimous or even nearly unanimous in corroborating the AHD Panel opinion.

The final possible "combination" of two categories is *Accepted/Restricted*. As shown in Table 20, there are 77 items in this "combination" category, with AHD Panel acceptance votes ranging from 1 to 92 percent. Twenty of the 77 items in this category are *Accepted* by eight of the nine dictionaries and *Restricted* by only one. Of these 20 items, the four having the highest AHD Panel votes are *hectic* (92 percent), *scan* (85 percent), *trek* (78 percent), and *through* (75 percent); the four receiving the lowest votes by the AHD Panel are *Xmas* (12 percent), *-wise* (16 percent), *someway* (17 percent), and *anxious* (23 percent "in writing"). Again, no correlation can be found between AHD Panel votes and acceptance by all but one of the nine dictionaries.

TABLE 19

USAGES EITHER *NOT TREATED* OR *RESTRICTED* BY NINE DICTIONARIES[a]

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY[b]	N/R
bad (c)	08w,25s	Ga	4/5
between (b)	01w,04s	Gp	5/4
consequential	34	Dx	7/2
drunk	17w	Gs	4/5
each (a)	05	Gs	6/3
erratum (b)	08	Gn	8/1
ever	26	Dc	8/1
first	49	Gs	8/1
kind (b)	25fw	Gs	7/2
(c)	76	Gs	8/1
leave (a)	63w	Dc	4/5
me	60s	Gp	4/5
participle (c)	"strongly recommend gerund"	Gs	6/3
reverend (a)	41	Im	2/7
(b)	37	Im	2/7
type (a)	06	Ip	6/3
were	19-33	Gv	8/1
who (c)	11w,17s	Gp	5/4
wish	39	Dc	6/3
Total Number of Items = 19			

[a] For definition of terms *Not Treated, Accepted, Restricted,* see p. 71.

[b] For key to symbols, see Table 1, p. 23.

Note: No items in this list were *Accepted* by any of the nine dictionaries. For each item, the number of dictionaries *Not Treating* (N) and the number *Restricting* (R) are shown. Figures are separated by a slash.

The rate of restriction is lower. In no case does one dictionary accept an item and the other eight restrict its use, and in no case do two dictionaries accept and seven reject an item. In twelve cases in Table 20, three dictionaries carry the item as *Accepted* and six as *Restricted.* In all twelve of these cases, the three most recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries – W3, WC7, and WC8 – are the accepting dictionaries. If the three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries had performed the duty expected of them by AHD Panel members and others, these 12 items would have appeared along with *ain't* (a and b) on a table of items *Restricted* in all nine dictionaries. The twelve items in question are *alibi* (a, b)., *buy, can* (a, b), *disinterested, enthuse, like* (b),

TABLE 20

USAGES EITHER *ACCEPTED* OR *RESTRICTED* BY NINE DICTIONARIES[a]

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY[b]	A/R	ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY[b]	A/R
ain't (c)	27w,60s	Gv	7/2	O.K.	20-57	Fs	4/5
alibi (a)	41w	Dx	3/6	only (b)	15	Fs	7/2
(b)	21w	Fs	3/6	overly	60w	Fd	7/2
alternative	42	Dx	5/4	presently (b)	49	Dx	8/1
anxious	28w,63s	Dx	8/1	quite (a)	81	Dx	7/2
balance	53w	Dx	6/3	(b)	86	Dx	7/2
blame	82	Iv	7/2	(c)	65	Dx	6/3
boast	55	Dx	8/1	quiz (a)	56	Dx	8/1
bus (b)	50	S	8/1	(b)	43	Dx	8/1
buy	39	Fs	3/6	quote	15	Fs	5/4
can (a)	30w	Dc	3/6	raise (a)	82	Dc	7/2
(b)	23w,40fs	Dc	3/6	rambunctious	84fw	Da	6/3
claim	69	Dx	8/1	rattle	86fw	Dx	6/3
contact	34	Dx	7/2	renege	74w	Dx	6/3
disinterested	07	Dc	3/6	rile	69fw	Da	3/6
dive	49w	Gv	8/1	scan	85w	Dx	8/1
done	53w	Dx	8/1	shakedown (a)	80	Dx	5/4
dope (a)	86w	Dx	4/5	(b)	67	Dx	3/6
(b)	92w	Dx	7/2	shall	62	Gv	7/2
due	16w	Dc	6/3	so (b)	83w	Im	5/4
enthuse (a)	24	Fb	3/6	some	13	Dc	3/6
farther (a)	20	Dc	6/3	someway	17	Dc	8/1
(b)	33	Dc	6/3	stall (a)	75w	Dx	4/5
(c)	11	Dc	6/3	stomp	24w	Dc	4/5
fault	52	Fs	7/2	straddle (a)	87	Dx	6/3
few (a)	23	Gs	4/5	(b)	57	Dx	4/5
(b)	33	Gs	4/5	through	75	Dx	8/1
(c)	32	Gs	4/5	transpire	38	Dx	6/3
hang (a)	31	Gv	6/3	trek	78	Dx	8/1
(b)	34	Gv	6/3	try (b)	59w	Fs	8/1
hectic	92	Dx	8/1	tycoon	90w	Dx	6/3
help	42f	Gs	8/1	type (b)	67	Dx	8/1
human	73	Fs	7/2	while (a)	68	Dx	7/2
ilk	65	Dx	7/2	(b)	59	Dx	7/2
like (a)	76f	Gs	4/5	(c)	37	Dx	7/2
(b)	25	Gs	4/5	win	33fw	Fs	6/3
most (a)	08w,47s	Dc	3/6	-wise	16	Fd	8/1
negotiate	46w	Dx	7/2	Xmas	12	S	8/1
oblivious (a)	70	Dx	8/1				

---

[a] For definition of terms *Not Treated*, *Accepted*, *Restricted*, see p. 71.

[b] For key to symbols, see Table 1, p. 23.

Note: No items in this list were *Not Treated* by any of the nine dictionaries. For each item, the number of dictionaries *Accepting* (A) and the number *Restricting* (R) are shown. Figures are separated by a slash.

most (a), *rile, shakedown* (b), and *some*. AHD Panel members registered votes on these items ranging from 7 to 69 percent, with one-half the votes being below 30 percent. This finding modifies only very slightly the general impression of lack of correlation between AHD Panel votes and treatment in other dictionaries. In none of the other groups of items treated in Tables 16 to 20 does the low level of application of restrictive labels in the three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries have discernibly similar effect. In the items in Table 18, where such an effect might be felt, analysis reveals that it is not. None of the cases in which only three dictionaries accept an item in that table involves all three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries.

No additional purpose would be served by the preparation and analysis of a table of the remaining 103 items from the list of 318 voted upon by the AHD Panel. Each of those 103 items, almost exactly one-third of the total, receives all three possible treatments in the nine dictionaries — *Not Treated/Accepted/Restricted*. A fairly typical item in this large group is *back*. *Back* (a) "back of" for "behind" is *Not Treated* in NWD1; it is *Accepted* in W3, WC7, WC8, and NWD2; it is *Restricted* in W2, RHD, RHCD, and SCD. *Back* (a) was accepted by 47 percent of the AHD Panel, *back* (b) by 50 percent. As can be seen from a survey of the Master List, instances involving all three treatments vary greatly as to the number of dictionaries assigning the item to each category. If not all possible combinations of nine dictionaries and three categories occur, nearly all do, further confirming the overwhelming impression of lack of unanimity among dictionaries.

Analyzing in a different way than has been done above the treatment of the 318 items in the nine dictionaries highlights broad differences between dictionaries. In Table 21, which shows this analysis, *Not Treated* is used as in the preceding discussion in this chapter. *Accepted*, however, is used in a slightly more restricted sense than heretofore to mean *only* that the item is defined or listed without comment of any kind. It will be remembered that in Tables 15-20 *Accepted* includes items discussed in notes but approved or accepted for all use in those notes.

Such items appear in either column 4 or column 5 in Table 21, not in column 2.

Table 21 shows the wide range among the nine dictionaries in choice of response or nonresponse to the 318 items voted upon by the AHD Panel. The significant generalizations about individual dictionaries suggested by these data have already been made in the characterizations of the various dictionaries presented earlier in this chapter; they will not be repeated here. The ranges of performance demonstrate the magnitude of the diversity both in habitual practice and in permissiveness-restrictiveness of the nine dictionaries. The number of items *Not Treated* in the nine dictionaries ranges from a low of 55 in W3 to a high of 130 in its abridgement, WC7. In the *Accepted* column, the number of items ranges from 59 in W2 to 244 in W3. It must be remembered in evaluating the last-mentioned figure that no attempt has been made in this study to evaluate the citations or verbal illustrations offered by W3 or to use them to classify items as *Accepted* or *Restricted*. If an item is defined and/or illustrated in the sense in question in W3, it is counted as *Accepted*.

TABLE 21

TREATMENT BY NINE DICTIONARIES OF 318 USAGES ON WHICH AN AHD USAGE PANEL VOTE IS REPORTED

DICTIONARY	NOT TREATED	ACCEPTED	RESTRICTIVE LABEL ONLY APPLIED	NOTE AGREES WITH AHD MAJORITY	NOTE DISAGREES WITH AHD MAJORITY	TOTAL
W2	108	59	89 (6) [a]	49	13	318
W3	55	244	7	5	7	318
WC7	130	177	1	6	4	318
WC8	104	203	0	7	4	318
RHD	87	137	25 (14)	57	12	318
RHCD	85	144	28 (16)	52	9	318
NWD1	128	96	66 (4)	18	10	318
NWD2	81	149	49 (5)	31	8	318
SCD	94	92	52 (12)	60	20	318
TOTAL	872	1301	317 (57)	285	87	2862

[a] Figures in parentheses represent instances in which both a label and a note appear. The figures outside parentheses in the "label" column do *not* include those within parentheses.

The third column in Table 21 shows the relative extent of exclusive dependence upon usage labels as indicators of status in the nine dictionaries. Figures in parentheses following the amounts in column 3 show the number of additional labels applied along with a note by each dictionary. The practices revealed by these figures are as erratic as the practice found in AHD. It appears to be accidental rather than planned when a dictionary uses both a label and a note to indicate restriction. Columns 4 and 5 show the relative amounts of agreement and disagreement with the AHD Panel majority expressed in notes in the nine dictionaries. Range is, as usual, quite wide; in the number of notes agreeing with the AHD Panel majority, the low is five in W3 and the high sixty in SCD; in notes disagreeing the range is from four in WC7 to 20 in SCD. An interesting fact revealed by the totals in Table 21 is that, although there is great variation in practice from dictionary to dictionary, the total number of times a label is used to indicate some restriction is 374 (317 + 57), almost exactly the same as the number of times a note is used – 372 (285 + 87).

A different kind of insight into the treatment of the 318 usages in the nine dictionaries is furnished by combining the figures in Table 21 into two broad categories. Combined as they are in Table 22, the figures provide a simple index of the extent to which each of the dictionaries and all of the dictionaries combined acknowledge as problems the 318 items voted upon by the AHD Panel. Column 1 in Table 22 combines the amounts in columns 1 and 2 in Table 21; column 2 combines the remaining columns. The range in acknowledgment of the existence of problems in the items concerned is from 11 out of 318 in WC7 to 151 out of 318 in W2. If the three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries are removed from consideration, the range narrows considerably to from 88 in NWD2 to 151 in W2.

The totals in Table 22 show that in 689 of 2,862 possible cases dictionaries acknowledge the existence of a problem; in 2,173 cases they do not. The ratio is almost exactly 1:3. If the three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries are removed from the calculation, the figures become 648 *Acknowledged* and 1,260 *Not Acknowledged*, a ratio of almost 1:2. This means that, even making the best possible case for the AHD list by eliminating from consideration three avowedly "liberal" dictionaries, in only one of every three possible cases does another dictionary consider or treat the item in question as a problem. This consideration or treatment does not mean, it must be remembered, that the dictionaries doing so *agree* with AHD judgments, but simply that they in some way raise a usage issue about the items. As has been seen above, agreement with AHD is far lower than the ratio of 1:2 suggests.

OBJECTIVITY IN DICTIONARY TREATMENT OF USAGE

The central issue raised by all of the foregoing discussion is a questioning of the claims to objectivity and descriptive accuracy in matters of usage made by dictionary editors. The claims have been quoted earlier at length. AHD takes an unabashedly *ipse dixit* position, saying that the best authorities are "professional writers and speakers" and furnishing percentage votes from a selected group meeting AHD criteria for membership in that group. W2 asserts that it determines the truth about usage through "the carefully checked judgment of the editorial staff." RHD judgments are "based on extensive research and thoughtful consideration," filtered through experts, and then reviewed by

TABLE 22

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AS USAGE PROBLEMS BY NINE DICTIONARIES OF 318 USAGES ON WHICH AN AHD USAGE PANEL VOTE IS REPORTED

DICTIONARY	EXISTENCE OF PROBLEM NOT ACKNOWLEDGED	EXISTENCE OF PROBLEM ACKNOWLEDGED	TOTAL
W2	167	151	318
W3	299	19	318
WC7	307	11	318
WC8	307	11	318
RHD	224	94	318
RHCD	229	89	318
NWD1	224	94	318
NWD2	230	88	318
SCD	186	132	318
TOTAL	2173	689	2862
Total Without W3, WC7, WC8	1260	648	1908

"a group of editors and teachers." NWD2 says it specifies "the status of any usage, as determined by trained lexicographers after a careful study of current writings and speech and disregarding the crotchets and prejudices of individuals. . . ." Other dictionaries make similar assertions, all claiming descriptive objectivity, but, when actual performance is evaluated across all the dictionaries studied, it becomes clear that the descriptive objectivity is that of the blind men examining the elephant. Each dictionary comes up with a different view of sociolinguistic reality. Each dictionary practices an "objectivity" unique to itself. One dictionary's *Slang* is another's *Colloq.*, and still another's *Substand.* When the AHD Usage Panel almost unanimously condemn an item, there is no way of predicting how other dictionaries will treat it.

Disinterested, for instance, is, according to 93 percent of the AHD Usage Panel, "not acceptable in the sense of *uninterested*. . . ." The oldest dictionary studied here, W2, labels *disinterested Now Rare,* indicating that it had had earlier use in the questioned sense but was not at the time of editing widely used. NWD1 and the three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries, W3, WC7 and WC8, define it as "uninterested" with no indication of restriction. W3 discusses *disinterested* in a synonymy s.v. *indifferent*, reasserting its use to mean "*uninterested*" and providing a quotation from C. L. Sulzberger showing its use in that sense. WC8 provides a different quotation from the same author. RHD and RHCD define *disinterested* as "uninterested," then discuss it in a synonymy: "*Disinterested, uninterested* are not properly synonyms. *Disinterested* today stresses absence of prejudice or of selfish interests: *a disinterested report*. *Uninterested* suggests aloofness and indifference. . . ." RHCD, but not RHD, additionally labels the sense "uninterested" *Nonstand.* NWD1 labels that sense *Colloq.* SCD prefaces the definition "uninterested" with the label *Loosely* and in a usage note redefines *disinterested* only in the sense of "having nothing to gain." The treatment of *disinterested* does not exemplify the most highly diverse set of reactions among the dictionaries to a specific item of usage, but it serves adequately as an example of the kind of diversity found — perhaps not quite the "average" in diversity, but nearly so, allowing for the high current interest in the term.

The outstanding example of unanimity in application of labels to be found in the entire list of items is in the treatment of *shakedown*. *Shakedown* (a and b) are accepted for unrestricted use in writing, the noun by 80 percent of the AHD Panel, the related verb *to shake down* by 67 percent. The AHD editors, however, second-guess the Panel by adding a limitation in the note to the effect that these uses are "not appropriate to deliberately formal usage." This does not appear a very propitious beginning for a description of unanimity, with the Panel splitting 4 to 1 and 2 to 1, respectively, on the usages, and the editors disagreeing with the Panel majorities. Five of the nine other dictionaries – W3, WC7, WC8, RHD, RHCD – list *shakedown* (noun) with no indication of restriction; three – W2, NWD1, NWD2 – label it *Slang*; SCD labels it *U.S. Slang*. Treatment of the verb in the nine other dictionaries more closely approaches a kind of unanimity. Three dictionaries list it without restriction – as expected, the three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries; *all* other dictionaries label it *Slang*. Here we have six dictionaries in unanimous agreement as to the status of a usage, but four other dictionaries disagree – W3, WC7, WC8, and AHD. So much for unanimity. The generally low level of agreement in the application of labels provides no basis for acceptance of claims of objectivity.

The search for consistency among all the dictionaries, including the AHD, considered in this study must be acknowledged a failure. Every analysis presented in the preceding pages shows that as far as the 318 items under study are concerned, the ten modern dictionaries studied are far, far more often in disagreement than they are in agreement. As there is no well developed external criterion or bench mark currently available to evaluate dictionary judgments on usage, the dictionaries' claims of objectivity and authoritativeness in the treatment of usage must be rejected.

CHAPTER 4

THE TREATMENT IN USAGE BOOKS OF USAGES VOTED UPON BY THE *AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY* USAGE PANEL

The analysis of practice in the treatment of usage which has been presented up to this point has revealed a remarkable diversity in claims and in performance in the works studied. *The American Heritage Dictionary* has been shown to be recondite in its method of selection of items to be evaluated, incautious in its method of presenting them for assessment, probably biased in its selection of "experts," and erratic in its editorial handling of the opinions of those experts. The *ipse dixit* method used by AHD in determining appropriateness or acceptability of a locution has been seriously challenged. Nine dictionaries other than AHD have been shown to differ among themselves and with AHD to such an extent that any claims to descriptive accuracy and objectivity in reporting on questioned or questionable usages have been rejected.

Perhaps it is too much to expect that ordinary dictionaries will perform well in this area. After all, the providing of information about usage in the sense in which we have been discussing it here is not the central function of dictionaries. They have other functions, both broader and less subject to personal whim than the provision of such information. But a special class of works has arisen, coming into full flower only in this century, devoted exclusively to that function. In a real sense, these works, here referred to as usage books, sometimes called "dictionaries of usage" or "handbooks of usage," combine features of the dictionary, the spelling book, the pronouncing dictionary, and the old-fashioned school grammar. Basically, they list alphabetically items on which usage is believed to be divided and, on some basis, attempt to resolve that division. Despite disclaimers to the contrary, they are, and are intended to be, prescriptive-proscriptive manuals of instruction. Even when the data on which they are based are as "objective" as possible, they usually render, either overtly or covertly, a decision. "Do this," they say, "Don't do that." The authors claim authority based either on experience or research, often some combination of the two, and they assert that they provide, if carefully read, a reliable guide to "careful" or "correct" or "appropriate" usage.

Ten usage books are considered in detail in the analysis which follows. They are listed below in order of date of publication, the dates – from 1927 to 1972 – covering roughly the same period as that covered by the ten dictionaries analyzed earlier. Abbreviations used to identify each work in the Master List[1] are shown in parentheses at the end of each entry. In subsequent discussion, works are referred to by the last name of the author.

George P. Krapp. *A Comprehensive Guide to Good English*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1927. (Kr)

Sterling Andrus Leonard. *Current English Usage*. Chicago: National Council of Teachers of English, 1932. (Le)

Bergen and Cornelia Evans. *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1957. (Ev)

Margaret Nicholson. *A Dictionary of American English Usage*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. (Ni)

Margaret Bryant. *Current American Usage*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, Inc., 1962. (Br)

Roy Copperud. *A Dictionary of Usage and Style*. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1964. (Co)

Theodore M. Bernstein. *The Careful Writer*. New York: Atheneum, 1965. (Be)

Wilson Follett. *Modern American Usage: A Guide*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1966. (Fo)

Raymond Crisp. "Change in Attitudes Toward English Usage." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971. (Cr)

Porter G. Perrin and Wilma R. Ebbitt. *Writer's Guide and Index to English*. Fifth Edition. Chicago: Scott-Foresman & Company, 1972. (Pe)

These ten works were chosen for study, and others excluded, for several reasons. First, as suggested above, they span roughly the same period of publication as do the dictionaries studied. Second, they deal, or purport to deal, with American rather than with British usage. It is on this basis that the revered *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*,[2] both in its original 1926 version by H. W. Fowler himself and in the 1965 revision by Sir Ernest Gowers, has been excluded from consideration. The Nicholson "Americanization" of Fowler has been included. One work not included in the list above, but referred to in the discussion, *Facts About Current English Usage*, by Albert H. Marckwardt and Fred Walcott, is not analyzed because it deals solely with the 230 or so items on which Sterling Andrus Leonard reports in

Current English Usage. Another work not included in the list to be analyzed in detail but to be referred to in later discussion is Roy Copperud's *American Usage: The Consensus,*[3] in which Copperud largely presents judgments based on majority opinion from works included in the analysis here, both dictionaries (W3, RHD, RHCD, AHD, SCD, ACD, NWD2) and usage books (Bernstein, Bryant, Copperud, Evans, Follet, and Perrin) plus a few others. Copperud's *Consensus* represents a partial, very loose, use of much of the data with which this study is concerned. To re-include the data on the basis on which it is presented in Copperud would be to invalidate any conclusions which might be drawn. Other works, both trade publications and educational publications designed for the freshman English course or for the high school, have been excluded on the grounds that their type is already adequately represented in the list above.

Chacterization of the works selected for inclusion is, of course, germane to the purpose of this study. A few general remarks will serve as an aid in placing each work in perspective. Included in the list are four usage guides prepared independently by members of the AHD Usage Panel – Copperud, Bernstein, Nicholson, and Follett; although Wilson Follett was not himself on the AHD Panel, having died before the Panel became operative, his usage guide was edited and prepared for publication after his death by a group headed by Jacques Barzun, who was a Panel member. Four of the books included were published before 1961, the year of the great W3 furor; one, although published a year later (Bryant), was probably not influenced by that uproar. Two works on the list have been published since the AHD was published in 1969, Crisp and Perrin. Three books qualify as "studies" in the scholarly sense – Leonard, Bryant, and Crisp, the last of these, a Ph.D. dissertation, being available only in photographic reproduction. The usage books vary greatly in range of problems covered and in number of entries; the three studies just mentioned deal almost exclusively with what their authors considered problems of grammar rather than of diction, each dealing with about 230 entries or specific locutions. Several of the trade books have up to 5,000 entries, one about 6,500, including lengthy articles on various aspects of grammar, style, rhetoric, and other matters. Each will be characterized in turn in the following pages.

George Philip Krapp: A Comprehensive Guide to Good English

The earliest work, George Philip Krapp's *A Comprehensive Guide to Good English,* was published in 1927, one year after Fowler's *Modern English Usage.* It was perhaps, for this reason, overshadowed by Fowler's work, which received wide attention on both sides of the Atlantic. The *Guide* is a monumental work by an extremely knowledgeable and perceptive scholar. Although the contents are now dated, and some of Krapp's attitudes and assumptions, suited to his times, are no longer fashionable or widely held, the *Guide* is still well worth reading. There are no general articles; all of the approximately 6,500 entries are on specific words or phrases, with emphasis on problems of diction, but with a heavy sprinkling of Latin and French entries, classical identifications, and pronunciations. In his "Introduction," Krapp says that he considers in the work "not merely questions of correctness, but also some of the finer adjustments of speech." He does not deal with what he calls "these obvious blunders and errors in English which no person even slightly interested in maintaining the purity of his speech would be likely to fall into," by which he means locutions such as "I seen him."[4]

The "Introduction," some 38 pages in length, includes the aim of the work and a description of its contents. Also discussed are dimensions of variability in language, the terminology used in the work, pronunciation, use of the book, suggestions for study, and a list of aphorisms on style (sample: "Style, like good manners, is best when least obtrusive."). An appendix contains grammatical rules, punctuation, and capitalization guides, and a list of abbreviations. Among the terms defined are the following, all used in the entries: *colloquial, low colloquial, literary, vulgar, dialect, local, correct, incorrect, idiom, trite, ungrammatical, slang, humor, newspaper style, awkward, inaccurate, technical, archaic, obsolete,* and *poetical.* Krapp's view of acceptability, as expressed in the "Introduction," is that a usage is "good and right when it is appropriate to the circumstances." The body of the book consists of a record of "the judgments which the author, with such wisdom as he possessed, felt it incumbent upon him to make."[5] No evasion, no appeal to outside authority, a calm assumption of authority and wisdom; the similarity to the claim to authoritativeness of Fowler is inescapable, but in Krapp, opinions are based on years of careful study of language.

Krapp deals with 143 of the 318 items upon which an AHD Usage Panel vote is reported; he accepts 24 of them, rejects or restricts 119. His rejection rate, 83 percent of the AHD items treated in his work, stamps him, predictably, as "most conservative," a position he shares with Nicholson and Bernstein, who reject the same percentage of items they consider.

STERLING ANDRUS LEONARD: CURRENT ENGLISH USAGE

In the period following World War I, the English teaching profession in America found itself faced with the problem of teaching "good" English to unprecedented numbers of children of native-born parents with little or no formal education and to children of non-English-speaking immigrant parents. In an attempt to cut a path through the endless numbers of "rules" and prohibitions which the school texts of those times featured, Sterling Andrus Leonard, who had earlier published an important historical survey of attitudes toward usage, *The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage: 1700-1800,*[6] launched a study to find which of the many "prohibited" or questioned usages were so widely avoided as to merit being taught in the schools. Leonard's *Current English Usage* was a pioneering work in the study of usage. He asked "experts" to report, not their personal preferences, but their judgment, based on observation of their currency and "level," of 230 usages "of whose standing there might be some question."[7] Most of the 230 were in the area broadly known as grammar, including syntax, verb form, noun and pronoun form, prepositional idioms, adjective-adverb comparisons and substitutability, etc. He also conducted a survey of and reported in the same work upon punctuation, but our concern here is with his survey of grammatical usage.

The 229 members of Leonard's panel of experts included National Council of Teachers of English members, well-known authors, editors of influential publications, businessmen, Modern Language Association members, teachers of speech, and a group – whose opinions he felt deserved special attention –of linguists, "lexicographers, philologists, grammarians." The judges were asked to assign each item on a 230-item questionnaire to one of four categories: (1) literary English, (2) standard, cultivated, colloquial English, (3) trade or technical English, (4) popular, or uncultivated English. Leonard devised a method of totaling and evaluating the returns, described earlier,[8] and ranked each item as *Established* (ranked as 1 or 2 by 75 percent or more), *Disputable* (ranked 1 or 2 by from 25 to 75 percent), or *Illiterate* (ranked 1 or 2 by less than 25 percent). His classification *Established* thus includes both literary and colloquial English, so that colloquial English is here actually treated in the way most dictionaries which use the label *Colloq* say they mean to treat it. Leonard reported his findings with totals for the whole group of experts and for the linguists only. Often the linguists and the whole group are in broad agreement, sometimes they differ, occasionally they differ widely. When they do differ, the linguists are usually the more tolerant.

Despite Leonard's injunction to his judges to rank items on the basis of observed usage, not personal preference, the language of the reported observations of the judges, which Leonard includes at length in his discussion of individual items, indicates quite clearly that they most often simply stated their own opinions or prejudices, rather than seriously attempted to report on actual usage as they had observed it. Leonard's own language in the report frequently implies that what is being reported is preference rather than observed usage.

Marckwardt and Walcott,[9] concerned that Leonard's findings could be misleading, as they reported opinion about usage rather than information based on usage itself, studied in a different way the same items as those considered by Leonard. They consulted W2, the OED, and the grammars of Jespersen, Curme, and others, as well as an earlier study of usage in American English by J. Lesslie Hall,[10] for recorded evidence of actual usage, and they classified the 230 items from Leonard as *Literary, Colloquial, American Literary, American Colloquial, Dialect,* or *Archaic*. They found, as reported earlier, that actual usage is a good deal less conservative than opinions about usage, and that there was good evidence that many of the items Leonard's experts had found to be disputable and even illiterate, were, in fact, good literary or colloquial English.[11] In so doing, of course, they demonstrated fairly and conclusively the inadequacy of the method employed thirty years later in the preparation of usage notes for the AHD, but, as must be perfectly clear by now, so-called authorities on usage do not, as a group, tend to be diverted from their activities by evidence.

Leonard's overall findings, the number and percentages of all the usages he studied which he placed in each category, have been summarized earlier in this study.[12] Included in his 230 items are 56 of the 318 on which an AHD Panel vote is reported, the fewest considered in any usage book in this study. His findings on the 56 items are that 10, or 18 percent of those considered, are *Accepted* (rated *Established* by both linguists and his whole group of experts), and 46, or 82 percent, are *Restricted.* The Marckwardt and Walcott findings are in violent disagreement on those 56 items. Their method of determining acceptability finds 4 *Restricted* and 51 *Accepted.* On one locution, *seem,* they could find no data. The Leonard findings are at the extreme conservative end of the range of works studied here, missing by only one percentage point the ultimate in conservatism expressed by Krapp, Bernstein, and Nicholson.

Margaret Nicholson: A Dictionary of American-English Usage

Margaret Nicholson's *A Dictionary of American-English Usage* is, as has been noted above, an Americanization and partial abridgement of Fowler's *Modern English Usage.* The cover copy provided by the publisher for Nicholson praises Fowler's work and proceeds to characterize Nicholson's adaptation.

> During the years since its [Fowler's] publication, however, numerous changes have affected language and usage, and many peculiarities of American speech and writing that Fowler either ignored or disdained have become acceptable. As a result there is a need for an up-to-date adaptation that not only recognizes these changes but also is designed as a ready reference for an American audience. Margaret Nicholson satisfies this need by adding to and subtracting from Fowler, while retaining as much as possible of the orignial which is always a delight to read.

When the Nicholson adaptation was published in 1957, it was well received. Among those who praised it in reviews were two who would later become co-members with her of the AHD Usage Panel, Gilbert Highet and John Kieran.[13] Margaret Nicholson is a professional editor; during the time she was preparing her work for publication, she was head of the publishing department at Oxford University Press, in which role she prepared the *Oxford Author's Style Book*. In her own brief "Preface," Nicholson refers to her *Dictionary* as "an adaptation of MEU, not a replacement . . . a simplified MEU, with American variations, retaining as much of the original as space would allow."[14]

The epigraph which Nicholson chooses to open her "Preface" announces the basis for judgments contained in the work. The statement is repeated from the article "Needless Variants" in both the original Fowler and in the Nicholson. "It is perhaps, then, rather a duty than a piece of presumption for those who have had experience in word-judging to take any opportunity . . . of helping things on by irresponsible expressions of opinion."[15]

There are about 5,500 entries in Nicholson, including a rather large number of extensive, detailed, circumstantial articles — taken largely unchanged from Fowler — on such topics as "subjunctive," "*which, that* as relatives," "Working and Stylish Words," etc.; the list of titles of the articles covers three and one-half pages in the front of the book. Many of the entries, are, by contrast, very brief, giving spelling only or pronunciation only for the entry word. Often the articles cite — and this is material introduced by Nicholson — the OED, W2, ACD, *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, and a few other works. Sometimes information from one or more of these sources is included, even though it seems contrary to the opinion expressed by Nicholson/Fowler. Nicholson does not employ a rich vocabulary of terms of disparagement. Most often the locutions in question are simply and flatly characterized as "right" or "wrong," in some straightforward expression such as "should not be used."

Nicholson treats 172 of the 318 AHD Usage Panel items. She indicates that she regards 29, or 17 percent of those 172 items, as acceptable, and 143, or 83 percent, as restricted. Her work shares the "most conservative" rank with Krapp and Bernstein, whose percentages of acceptance and restriction are identical with hers.

BERGEN AND CORNELIA EVANS, A DICTIONARY OF CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN USAGE

The brother and sister team of Bergen and Cornelia Evans produced *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage* in the same year as Nicholson published her work, 1957. Both Evanses have scholarly and editorial backgrounds. Bergen Evans has been television master of ceremonies of a widely viewed television program on language, and has had a long and eminent career as professor of English at Northwestern University. Cornelia is a novelist and editor in her own right. The Evanses made a serious effort to produce a work whose judgments would be based upon actual usage rather than opinions about usage. They constantly refer to their sources of information, among which are the OED, the works of Jespersen, Fries, Mencken, Curme, J. Lesslie Hall, Robert A. Hall, Leonard, Marckwardt, Robert Pooley, Thomas Pyles, and others.[16] But, in the final analysis they are candid in saying that they are not always successful in following their sources.

> Throughout the book the authors have tried to present the facts about current usage fairly and accurately. They are aware that there is more than one kind of English. As children, living in the north of England, they spoke a dialect that was in many ways nearer to the English of Chaucer than to that of the *New York Times*. They have, therefore, a personal affection for forms that are older than our current literary forms. As adults they have both had occasion, over many years, to read a great deal of manuscript English, the unedited writings of college students and adults working in various professions. They hope that this wide acquaintance with the language has kept them from giving too much weight to their personal preferences. But they have a personal bias, and this should be stated clearly. The authors are prejudiced in favor of literary forms. They prefer the forms used by the great writers of English to forms found only in technical journals. This means that if they list a non-literary form as acceptable there is conclusive evidence that it is accepted. But they may have listed some forms as questionable that are standard in some areas or professions.[17]

The approximately 5,000 entries in Evans deal with grammar, word preferences, style, punctuation, idiomatic phrases, spelling, and other topics not easily classifiable; there is, for example, an article on Boston Accent. Standard prefixes and suffixes are listed and discussed, and terms of rhetoric and prosody are defined. Many of the articles are long: the article on linking verbs runs a full page, that on passive voice a page and a half, and the article on plural nouns two pages. The work is rich in highly detailed information, much in the style of the original Fowler; the article on humor, for instance, contains a detailed discussion of a series of related terms, producing a highly discriminating synonymy.

Evans has the most complete coverage of items voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel of any of the usage books analyzed here. It treats 198 items, almost two-thirds of the 318 in AHD. It is also, on balance, the most "liberal" in its evaluation of the items of which it treats. Evans rates 117, or 60 percent, of the AHD items discussed, as *Accepted*; the remainder, 81 items or 40 percent of those discussed, are *Restricted*, often outright rejected. Despite its general liberalism, Evans takes an extremely hard line on the discrimination of meaning between words which are sometimes treated as synonyms; *disinterested*, for example, is not accepted as synonymous with *uninterested*. Even where an insistence on restriction in sense occurs, however, it is often encased in a sensible discussion of the cause for the confusion. Of *flaunt* vs. *flout*, for instance, Evans says, "The confusion is not as amazing as some writers profess to find it because the two acts are often related: one who *flaunts* unconventionality often *flouts* the conventions or mores of the community."

MARGARET M. BRYANT: CURRENT AMERICAN ENGLISH

The second of the more academic or scholarly studies analyzed here is *Current American Usage*, edited by Margaret M. Bryant and published in 1962. Bryant's *Current American English* grew out of the work of the Committee on Current English Usage of the National Council of Teachers of English. The collecting and editing of the material extended from 1951 to 1961, at the beginning under the editorship of James B. McMillan of the University of Alabama, from 1956 to publication under Bryant's editorship.

Bryant contains about 240 entries dealing, almost exclusively, with matters of syntax, morphology, and idiom. There is little on pronunciation or on matters of diction, which topics are the backbone of the usual usage book; *anyhow, anyway, anyplace, anywhere, date, each and every*, and perhaps ten other items make up the entire list of nongrammar entries. There are more than thirty general articles on such topics as agreement, comparison, preposition at end of clause, and double negative. Nearly eighty, or one-third of the entries, deal with verbs, mainly strong verbs whose principal parts are matters of divided usage. The data for the discussion of most verb forms was drawn from summaries of Linguistic Atlas records for New England and other regions. The terminology used is carefully discussed and defined in the "Introduction":[18] *standard* and *nonstandard, formal, informal, colloquial.* Every entry contains a summary of the data upon which the conclusion offered is based.

Bryant herself outlines in the "Introduction" the nature of the information contained. The book "presents the dependable evidence available – not only that from various scholarly dictionaries, from the treatises of linguists, and from articles in magazines featuring English usage, but also from that of some 900 fresh investigations undertaken especially for use in this book." Bryant specifies clearly that the conclusions drawn do not "depend upon personal impressions, which inevitably are based on limited observation. The collective impressions of the investigators, even though they are more observant of usage than most people are, would still be an unsafe guide."[19] The most serious weakness in this work is in the nature of the data on which the conclusions are based. The 900 studies mentioned by Bryant were conducted by students in graduate courses, many of them at her own Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, and they appear to be of varying dependability, as student work frequently is. Some of her other data are the result of piecemeal independent investigation by various individuals in various ways of the occurrence or nonoccurrence of usages in which they had an interest. Bryant has a tendency to treat all data as equally sound and valid in her analyses. Nevertheless, allowing for the limitations of the data, the conclusions are firmly based on such data as were available.

The results of Bryant's analyses, insofar as the items shared with the list voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel are concerned, are in the middle range in conservatism. Bryant treats 84 items from the AHD list; 33 (40 percent) are found to be acceptable without limitation, and 51 (60 percent) restricted in use in some way. This ratio of accepted to rejected items represents a position less conservative than that of Copperud but more conservative than Perrin's.

ROY H. COPPERUD: A DICTIONARY OF USAGE AND STYLE

Roy H. Copperud, a professional journalist and teacher of journalism, has produced a number of dictionaries of usage. For many years, Copperud conducted "Editorial Workshop," a column on style and usage in *Editor and Publisher*, a leading journal of the newspaper world. His earlier book *Words on Paper*,[20] grew out of that column as does the one analyzed in this study. A later work, *American Usage: The Consensus*[21] has been briefly characterized above. It will be referred to in later discussions. Only his *A Dictionary of Usage and Style*, published in 1964, is included in the analyses of this study. Copperud brings a lively style, an open mind, and some rueful sense of the futility and tendency to molehill inflation which characterizes much of the writing about usage. In the "Preface," he sets the tone and aim of the work.

> The best a dictionary like this can do is to develop the user's critical faculty. If he becomes sensitive to inaccuracies, redundancies, unnecessary complexities, and slipshod constructions, he will forestall most of these lapses unaided. His writing will gain in precision and effect far more from an acute critical sense than from any attempt at remembering a mass of details.
>
> My purpose is to offer the reader information on which to base an intelligent choice of language, to encourage precision, and to discourage excess. The first aim of this book is that he who writes should subordinate everything to the ease of the reader, while conveying exactly, unmistakably, and—if possible—engagingly what he intends.

Copperud also understands the nature of usage and of pronouncements about usage.

> Usage is a matter of taste . . . No encompassing agreement exists among even the most discriminating writers concerning usages that are beyond the pale. What one condemns and shuns, another will employ freely and without apparent awareness that it has been criticized—or, sometimes, with deliberate disregard for what he considers pedantry or superstition. Announced principles are more conservative than practice—even the practice of the severest critics.[22]

It is not only in the "Preface" that Copperud displays a highly developed sense of the mutability of usage. In many of the articles, his awareness of change both in language and opinion is made clear.

Copperud contains about 2,100 entries. Included are 120 major articles, listed in the front matter of the book, 86 of which are on general topics, the remaining ones on specific words, such as *that*, which present a number of problems. The major emphasis in the entries is on diction, with special emphasis on discrimination between pairs of closely related words – *naked/nude, concert/recital, competence/competency*, etc. Many phrases and tags from quotations or misquotations are also entered – "mills of God," "in the altogether," "in view of the fact that," etc.

Copperud lists twenty-five references, including most recent dictionaries and usage books. He offers no glossary of terms used or suggestions about levels of usage, restrictive labels, or the like. Among the expressions he uses to condemn or approve usages are the following: *superstition, generally preferable, schoolgirl style, not in good order, bookish, not good usage, sub-literate, pomposity, natural, illogical, instinctive, genteelism, cliche.* His style is pleasant, witty without being cute.

Copperud treats 175 of the 318 problems voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel. Only Evans and Bernstein among the usage books treat a larger number of the AHD problems. Of the 175 usages, Copperud accepts 77, or 44 percent, and indicates restrictions on the use of 98, or 56 percent. His position, considering only the AHD-chosen usages studied, is among the most liberal of the usage books. Evans and Crisp are the only two which accept a larger percentage of the items discussed.

THEODORE M. BERNSTEIN: THE CAREFUL WRITER

Theodore M. Bernstein, author of *The Careful Writer*, published in 1965, is among the best known of American "authorities" on usage. The publisher's copy on the cover of Bernstein says that he "is widely regarded as a latter-day Fowler." Bernstein has had a long and eminent career in journalism, having started, appropriately enough, as a copy editor on the *New York Times* in 1925, and rising eventually in the mid-sixties to assistant managing editor. For twenty-five years during his career as a journalist, he also taught at Columbia University School of Journalism. Bernstein is widely known for "Winners and Sinners," an occasional bulletin which he originated from his desk at the *New York Times* in which he displayed and discussed examples of what he considered good and bad writing and journalistic practice. Those bulletins became the basis for his earlier *Watch Your Language*[23] and for the more complete *The Careful Writer*. A later work, *Miss Thistlebottom's Hobgoblins*,[24] is an anti-purist tract dealing with a relatively small number of items, and including reprints of editorial "Don'ts" by William Cullen Bryant and Ambrose Bierce.

Bernstein is firmly anti-W3 and anti-structural-linguist; that being so, he is, of course, also a member of the AHD Usage Panel. It will be remembered that he is credited with having prepared the usage notes for RHD, but there is evidence to indicate that the notes published do not represent his position on some matters.

In a lengthy introduction to *The Careful Writer*, which he entitles "Careful – and Correct,"[25] Bernstein sets up a straw man in the opening paragraphs. Having indicated that he intends to pronounce upon usage, he deplores the fact that it is no longer possible to do so without challenge. "The challengers say – or seem to say – that no one has any business pronouncing on usage, that the only authority in the field is the unclear, imprecise, and often vulgar voice of the masses."[26] No challenger has, of course, said that, but the charge enables Bernstein to identify himself clearly as a mandarin, and it provides a mythical counterposition to his own, ignoring completely the many sensible and judicious appeals which have been made to the actual practices of edited, literate, written English – as opposed to the opinions of those who edit it – as a guide to good usage.

In an attempt to show that more than personal opinion is involved in his judgments, Bernstein cites six numbered sources for his information (italics added):

> . . . The guides to good usage presented in this book arise from six sources:
>
> First, the practices of reputable writers, past and present.
>
> Second, the observations and discoveries of linguistic scholars. The work of past scholars has, *when necessary*, been *updated*. The work of contemporary scholars has been *weighed judiciously*.
>
> Third, the predilections of teachers of English—*wherever—right or wrong, like it or not*—these predilections have become deeply ingrained in the language itself.
>
> Fourth, *observation of what makes for clarity, precision, and logical presentation*. In some instances such observation brings forth something akin to spit and polish, and just as spit and polish is valuable in the running of a taut ship so it is valuable in the disciplining of writing.
>
> Fifth, *personal preferences of the author*—and why not? If reputable writers are entitled to personal preferences and the whims of the multitude are often heeded, why should I be left out. *After all, it's my book*.
>
> Sixth, *experience in critical examination of the written word* as an editor of The New York Times, a newspaper that strives, perhaps a mite harder than most newspapers, for precision, accuracy, clarity, and—especially in recent years—good writing.[27]

The italicized phrases in all but the first source listed indicate that, in a real sense, they are all the same source – Bernstein's opinion. The emendation of opinions of others, the selective acceptance of school grammar "rules," the observation and experience cited are all by Bernstein. As for the first source, almost without exception the writers quoted in the entries themselves are, apparently, *New York Times* reporters and writers contemporaneous with Bernstein, and are most frequently – almost always – quoted as examples of bad writing. Assuming they are reputable, that leaves the practices of the writers of the past subject also to Bernstein's memory and opinion.

There are about 2,000 entries in Bernstein, many of them brief, flat statements about an idiom or usage: "Despair: Takes preposition *of*." A large number of the general articles are lengthy and detailed: "Curdled Clichés" runs to three pages, "Danglers" is a full page, "Number" occupies six pages, and "Punctuation" occupies eight. As an indication of the intensity with which some problems are viewed, the article "Different From, Different Than" runs to three pages. The vocabulary is often strongly and flatly negative. "*Depreciate* is almost never misused; *deprecate* almost always is." *Ilk*, as commonly used today, is "always erroneous." *Flatly* as an intensifier is "almost always superfluous."

Bernstein shares with Krapp and Nicholson the "most conservative" position among the usage books studied. It is second only to Evans in the number of items treated from the list of those on which an AHD Usage Panel vote is reported, treating of 184 items. Of those 184, 32 or 17 percent are accepted, and 152 or 83 percent are restricted in use, often totally so.

Wilson Follett: Modern American Usage

Wilson Follett's *Modern American Usage* was incomplete when Follett died in 1963. It was edited and completed by a group under the leadership of Jacques Barzun; the group consisted of Carlos Baker, Frederick W. Dupee, Dudley Fitts, James D. Hart, Phyllis McGinely, and Lionel Trilling. There are approximately 1,000 entries in Follett, many of them quite long and circumstantial. Many of the individual words or phrases listed alphabetically are discussed only in a more general article, so that the listing simply refers the reader to that article. There are lengthy articles on various matters of diction, of idiom, of grammar, including syntax and morphology, and of style. *Shall* and *will* are discussed in a separate twenty-three page appendix, and there is a forty-eight page appendix on punctuation.

Follett is the most ardent and polemical of the usage books considered here. This statement will come as no surprise to any who have read his *Atlantic* article, "Sabotage in Springfield," in which he characterized W3 as "out to destroy . . . every obstinate vestige of linguistic punctilio, every surviving influence that makes for the upholding of standards, every criterion for distinguishing between better usages and worse."[28] A lengthy introductory section contains three essays: "On Usage, Purism, and Pedantry," "On the Need of an Orderly Mind," and "On the Need of Some Grammar."[29] The first essay begins with an attack on the straw man linguists who "deny that there is such a thing as correctness."[30] Against the background of this attack, the aim of the work is stated. The book ". . . seeks to serve two related purposes. By analyzing structural errors and ambiguities it reminds writers and speakers of grammatical norms that are frequently flouted; and by discussing words and idioms it provides a list of distinctions and suggestions in the realm of tact."[31] Follett rejects flatly the possibility that an analysis, statistical or otherwise, of actual uses of language might provide sound guidance on usage. "This discussion draws its authority from the principle that good usage is what people who care about words believe good usage to be."[32]

Follett shares the view that the language is in danger, that "most people speak carelessly and clumsily." The book "concentrates on the prevailing faults of current speech and prose."[33] "The danger to the language . . . does not come from those unhappily sunk in ignorance and vulgarity; it comes from the entire range of the population, which is sunk in the swamp of jargon, and which complains of it without knowing how to extricate itself."[34] The last of the three brief essays ends in a resounding peroration – perhaps more accurately "perscription," but the oratorical effect is inescapable: "It is a duty to maintain the continuity of speech that makes the thought of our ancestors easily understood, to conquer Babel every day against the illiterate and heedless, and to resist the pernicious and lulling dogma that in language – contrary to what obtains in all other human affairs – whatever is is right and doing nothing is for the best."[35]

Follett treats of only 115 of the 318 AHD items – a rather smaller number than the other major works on usage. Of these 115, 42 or 21 percent are *Accepted*, 91 or 79 percent *Restricted*. Follett is only slightly, probably insignificantly, less conservative than the four most conservative works, which restrict 82 or 83 percent of the items they consider.

RAYMOND D. CRISP: "CHANGES IN ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH USAGE"

The early attempt by Leonard to secure objective information on usage has been discussed above. Nearly forty years after the Leonard study was published, Raymond D. Crisp replicated the study, with some changes in detail, as a Ph.D. dissertation. His dissertation, "Changes in Attitudes Toward English Usage" was completed in 1971 at the University of Illinois. The purpose of Crisp's study was two-fold: "to determine how much change has occurred in certain items . . . over a period of forty years or so," and "to determine current attitudes toward certain items or expressions in English usage."[36] Despite the obvious failure of Leonard to secure reports of accurate observation of usage, Crisp attempted to have his experts score the items "according to your observation of actual usage rather than your opinion of what usage should be."[37] He had the good sense, having read comments from many participants in the study that they could not follow that instruction,[38] to include the word "attitudes" in the title of his thesis.

Crisp submitted a list of 215 items to 1,764 members of various groups; he received 788 completed questionnaires. The groups included contemporary authors, businessmen, members of various sections in the National Council of Teachers of English, members of the Modern Language Association, speech teachers, editors of prominent magazines and of newspapers, television and radio commentators, and the entire AHD Usage Panel (he received completed questionnaires from 42 of the 105 Panel members). Because some of the items assessed by Leonard no longer were widely regarded as problems, Crisp included only 184 of Leonard's original 230. He followed approximately the Leonard method of instructing respondents, and of classifying locutions, changing, as has been mentioned above, Leonard's classification *Illiterate* to *Nonstandard*.

He found, as might have been predicted, that majority opinions had changed on a number of items in the forty or so years since the publication of the Leonard study. Among locutions which both the linguists and the whole group in his study ranked as now *Established* are *can, data, dive, good, leave.* All these had been ranked *Disputable* in the Leonard study. An interesting corollary finding in Crisp confirms what the present study demonstrates – that AHD Panel members are, as a group, the most conservative of any of the groups identified in his study, and that linguists are the least conservative. Ninety-three of the 150 language specialists he invited to participate returned completed questionnaires. The range in "kinds" of language specialists asked to participate is wide, ranging from Raven I. McDavid, Jr. to Noam Chomsky, from James H. Sledd and Robert P. Stockwell to Charlton Laird. Included on his list of language specialists are Margaret Bryant, Bergen and Cornelia Evans, and Albert H. Marckwardt, whose works are considered here, and another, whose works aren't, Rudolf Flesch. The list does not consist by any means entirely, or even mainly, of the dread structural linguists.

Because Crisp introduced some items not covered in the Leonard study, the total number of items shared with the list of items voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel differs from that in the Leonard study. Crisp treats 61 of the AHD items. Thirty-six or 58 percent are found to be *Accepted* (rated *Established* by both linguists and the whole group) and 25 or 42 percent *Restricted.* Remembering that Crisp is reporting attitudes, it is somewhat surprising to find that this percentage is only two points less than that of Evans, which is the least conservative of the usage books. The ratio of acceptance to rejection in this selected group of items differs somewhat from the ratio for all the items covered by the Crisp study. Of the 215 items in the study, 44 percent are *Accepted* and 56 percent *Restricted.* Nevertheless, Crisp's findings indicate an overall decrease in what has here been called conservatism in attitudes toward usage.

PORTER G. PERRIN: WRITER'S GUIDE AND INDEX TO ENGLISH

Porter G. Perrin's *Writer's Guide and Index to English,* now in its fifth edition (1972), has been a standard, widely used text for college-level composition courses since its original publication in 1939. The latest edition is the work of Wilma R. Ebbitt (formerly of the University of Chicago), who participated in the preparation of several of the earlier editions. The book is really two bound as one – the "Writer's Guide"[39] is a handbook with discussions of style, rhetoric, grammar, sentence structure, documentation, etc.; the "Index"[40] contains articles, arranged alphabetically, of four kinds – (1) articles on individual words and constructions; (2) articles on the correction and revision of papers; (3) articles on English grammar; and (4) articles on general topics in language, including one on American and British usage, and a long article on the English language. The "Index" is almost 300 pages and contains approximately 1,500 entries.

Perrin has a long-established reputation for moderation in matters of usage. The first chapter of the "Writer's Guide"[41] contains a careful discussion of variation in English; it includes an analysis of English into standard and nonstandard varieties and discussions of *Informal*, *Formal*, and *General* English, carefully defining the limits of each and suitable occasions for their use. The category *General* is, as far as I can determine, an innovation in Perrin. *General English* is defined as "Both spoken and written. The speaking and writing of educated people in most situations. Typical uses: conversation; talks to general audiences; most correspondence, most college papers, and most newspapers, magazines, and books." The classification contrasts with *Informal*, which is more often spoken than written, and *Formal*, more often written than spoken.

The articles on individual items in the "Index" are straightforward and sensible in tone, avoiding *ipse dixit* pronouncements of rightness or wrongness, but at the same time cautioning the reader about attitudes held by some toward specific locutions. "Even though *disinterested* in the sense 'uninterested' is established in General usage, a writer who uses it should know he risks being thought semiliterate." Again, "*Flaunt*, to 'wave, display boastfully,' is frequently used with the sense 'treat with contempt, scorn,' the meaning traditionally assigned to *flout*. Readers aware of the distinction deplore the confusion."

Sources of judgments in Perrin are not often explicitly stated, although many entries are followed by a reference or two, and some include one or more citations from contemporary writing.

Among the references listed in Perrin are Bryant, Evans, Fowler, Marckwardt and Walcott *Facts About Current English Usage* and, interestingly, the 1917 work by J. Lesslie Hall, *English Usage*.

Perrin treats 115 of the 318 usages voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel, classifying 36 or 31 percent *Accepted*, and 79 or 69 percent *Restricted*. These figures place Perrin in a roughly middle position in the works surveyed. Four of the other usage books surveyed are more conservative, five less.

In each of the preceding characterizations of usage books, an assessment has been offered as to the relative conservatism or tendency to restrict usages to other than the full range of levels and styles. The figures upon which these assessments are based are assembled in Table 23. The figures demonstrate (1) the range in number of items treated, and (2) the range in "conservatism," as shown in the ratio of *Restricted* to *Accepted* items. In number of items treated, the range is from 56 to 198; if the three scholarly works – Leonard, Bryant, and Crisp – are excluded on the grounds that they generally treat only items of grammatical usage, the range is from 115 to 198. In percentage of items *Restricted*, the range is from 40 to 83 percent; excluding the three scholarly works has no effect on this figure, as Evans restricts the lowest percentage and Krapp, Nicholson, and Bernstein the highest; the three scholarly works just about duplicate the range covered by all ten works – from 42 to 82 percent *Restricted*. These figures are descriptive only of overall tendencies, as the information next to be discussed will show, not of agreement with each other or with the AHD Panel on an item-by-item basis. Each usage book handles a different subset of the 318 AHD items.

TABLE 23

NUMBER OF ITEMS FROM AHD LIST *ACCEPTED* AND *RESTRICTED* IN TEN USAGE BOOKS

Usage Book	Usages Accepted No.	Usages Accepted %	Usages Restricted No.	Usages Restricted %	Total
Krapp	24	17	118	83	143
Leonard	10	18	46	82	56
Nicholson	29	17	143	83	172
Evans	117	60	81	40	198
Bryant	33	40	51	60	84
Copperud	77	44	98	56	175
Bernstein	32	17	152	83	184
Follett	42	21	91	79	115
Crisp	36	58	25	42	61
Perrin	36	31	79	69	115
TOTAL	418	32	885	68	1303

Note: These figures take into account only those items included in the list of 318 usages on which AHD Usage Panel Votes are reported.

ANALYSIS OF TREATMENT IN TEN USAGE BOOKS OF 318 USAGES VOTED UPON BY THE AHD USAGE PANEL

In the analysis presented in the preceding chapter of treatment by nine other dictionaries of the 318 usages upon which an AHD Usage Panel vote is reported, it was shown that the dictionaries were more or less in unanimous agreement with AHD on only two usages – "Ain't I?" and "It ain't" – more or less, because, although they were united in classifying these usages as *Restricted,* they disagreed somewhat on the reasons offered. Not even on those two usages can the claim of unanimity be made for the ten usage books analyzed, inasmuch as one of them – Follett – has no entry on *ain't.* The other nine which do enter the item do, of course, agree with each other and the AHD Panel on those two uses of *ain't.*

Usage book responses to items in the AHD list have been counted and classified in the same way as were the dictionary responses reported earlier. Usage book responses are at once easier and more difficult to tabulate than dictionary responses. They are easier because, if an item is entered at all, most often a clear judgment as to its status is explicitly stated. In a dictionary, any usage entered may be deemed *Accepted* only if no label is applied, and if no usage note indicates otherwise, and if no synonymy – either at the entry for the word in question or at that for some related word – says or suggests otherwise. Some few of the more discursive usage book entries, though, are more difficult to interpret. Because on occasion careful writers about usage prefer to lay out the evidence – from history, from "authorities," or from observed usage – which they have assembled, and to take, or appear to take, a noncommittal position, such entries must be carefully evaluated to decide whether, on balance, the entry recommends or urges restriction in use. In general, a statement that "authorities" or "careful writers and editors" or some such group disapprove of or avoid a usage has been taken as a recommendation of restriction in use.

As in the analysis of dictionary practices, treatment in usage books of the AHD items is classified under one of three designations: *Not Treated* – the specific item or locution or sense is not referred to in any way; *Accepted* – the item is entered, discussed, and pronounced acceptable for use in all styles and at all levels, without restriction; *Restricted* – the usage is disapproved of or some limitation is placed upon it. There are seven possibilities of occurrence or co-occurrence of these designations for a given item in the ten usage books. It has already been indicated that there are no instances of one of the possibilities; there are no items which all the usage books agree should be *Restricted*. As Table 24 shows, there are also no items rated by all ten usage books as *Accepted*.

TABLE 24

318 AHD USAGE ITEMS CLASSIFIED AS TO TREATMENT IN TEN USAGE BOOKS

Classification	Number of Items	Percentage of Total
Not Treated (N)	30 (21)	10 (7)
Accepted (A)	0 (29)	0 (9)
Restricted (R)	0 (2)	0 (.5)
Either Not Treated or Accepted (N/A)	16 (68)	5 (21)
Either Not Treated or Restricted (N/R)	106 (19)	33 (6)
Either Accepted or Restricted (A/R)	14 (77)	4 (24)
Either Not Treated, Accepted, or Restricted (N/A/R)	152 (103)	48 (32)
TOTAL	318 (318)	

Note: For explanation of classifications, see above. Comparable figures for dictionaries are shown in parentheses.

Table 24 shows the number and percentage of items from the 318 voted on in AHD which ten usage books assign to the classifications or combinations of classification listed. Comparable figures for the nine dictionaries are furnished in parentheses. Some general conclusions may be drawn. There is less unanimity among usage books than among dictionaries. On only 10 percent of the items and in only one classification are the usage books unanimous. The dictionaries are unanimous on 16.5 percent of the items and in three classifications. Nearly one-half of the items (152) are spread across all three categories in the usage books (Not Treated/Accepted/Restricted); on only one-third are the dictionaries similarly divided. Part of this disparity must be attributed to the fact that dictionaries generally have entries for all items considered to be a part of the language and having high enough frequency of occurrence to have come to the lexicographers' attention. Usage books enter only those items considered by the author or others to present problems. The relatively low level of acceptance and high level of restriction shown by the usage books is attributable to the same cause.

There are 30 items in the list of 318 upon which an AHD Panel vote is reported which are *Not Treated* in any of the ten usage books. Table 25 lists the items, which in AHD received acceptance votes by the Usage Panel ranging from 8 to 97 percent. The *Not Treated* items constitute about 10 percent of all the items in the AHD list, and that figure is meaningful in the assessment of AHD practice. *Not one* of the ten usage books analyzed here regarded any one of these 30 items as a problem in usage worthy of comment. In contrast with the dictionaries, in which the 21 items *Not Treated* consisted of roughly half grammar and half diction items, the items so classified in the usage books are two-thirds diction items (20); there are only 3 grammar items *Not Treated* in the usage books. Three items are in the *Not Treated* category in both dictionaries and usage books – *anyone, important,* and *leave* (b).

Table 26 lists 16 items either *Not Treated* or *Accepted* in the ten usage books. Placement on this list means that any usage book which treats the item regards it as *Accepted,* but it is not treated in all ten books. AHD votes on these items cover nearly the full range of possibilities – from 9 to 96 percent. There are 160 possibilities of action on 16 items in ten usage books. Of the

160 possibilities, 108 or 68 percent of the occurrences in this list are *Not Treated*; only 52 or 32 percent of the actions are *Accepted* ratings. Eight items on this list occur also in the list of 67 items similarly classified in the nine dictionaries studied: ***agenda*** (b), ***commentate, cope, most*** (b), ***nicely, sick*** (a), ***though, which.*** That they occur on both lists is persuasive evidence that they are nonproblems. Of ten usage books and nine dictionaries, all which refer to these items classify them as *Accepted.* AHD Panel votes on the items range from 9 to 96 percent, with one-half the votes being below 50 percent and one-half above. There is, in other words, absolutely no correlation between AHD Panel opinion on these items as a group and the opinion of nine other dictionaries and ten usage books. To return to the treatment of these 16 items by the usage books, it should be noted also that most often in only one or two of the

TABLE 25

USAGES *NOT TREATED* BY TEN USAGE BOOKS

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY	ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY
alibi (b)	21	Fs	leave (b) #	81w	Dc
anyone #	36	Gs	premiere	14	Fs
bit	13	Gs	rambunctious	84	Da
bug	69w,86s	Dx	rate (a)	26w	Dx
bus (a)	48w,60s	Fs	(b)	35w	Dx
(b)	50	S	shakedown (a)	80	Dx
compensate	75	Dx	(b)	67	Dx
dope (b)	92w	Dx	sick (b)	81	Dx
dropout	97	Dx	spark	71	Dx
escalate	75	Fb	spoof (a)	82	Dx
foremost	76	Dx	(b)	66	Dx
headquarter	08	Fb	stall (b)	62w	Iv
idle	62	Dx	straddle (a)	87	Dx
important #	50	Ga	(b)	57	Dx
lack	42	Iv	type (b)	67	Dx

Total number of items = 30

#Items followed by this symbol are also not entered in any dictionary studied. They are unique to AHD.

Note: No items in this list were *Accepted* or *Restricted* in any of ten usage books. No book treated any item on this list in the sense in question. For definition of the terms *Not Treated, Accepted, Restricted,* see p. 107. For a key to the symbols in the column headed *Category,* see Table 1, p. 23.

usage books is an item *Accepted*. Quite often that acceptance is in Evans, which has the widest coverage of all of the 318 items, but Bryant, Leonard, Copperud, Krapp, and Perrin are also included among the accepting works. The probable reason for the difference in number of items in this "combination" category between usage books, with 16 items, and dictionaries, with 68 items, has already been mentioned above. Usage books ordinarily do not enter items which present no problems in usage. A possible conclusion to be drawn from this is that all 68 items on the list of items either *Not Treated* or *Accepted* by the dictionaries should be considered nonproblems. However, the case for this conclusion is not as strong as that for the similar conclusion drawn about the eight items discussed above.

The 106 items listed in Table 27 are either *Not Treated* or *Restricted* in the ten usage books. All usage books which treat

TABLE 26

USAGES EITHER *NOT TREATED* OR *ACCEPTED* BY TEN USAGE BOOKS

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY	N/A
agenda (a)	86	Gn	3/7
(b)	59	Gn	6/4
can (c)	89s	Dc	8/2
(d)	72	Dc	8/2
commentate	09vt, 19vi	Fb	9/1
complete	67	Dw	8/2
cope	25fw	Iv	9/1
erratum (b)	08	Gn	9/1
most (b)	86w, 96s	Dx	9/1
nicely	68	Dx	9/1
none	68	Gs	2/8
participle (b)	"substantial majority"	Gs	7/3
presently	73	Dx	6/4
sick (a)	49	Ip	8/2
though	39fw	Gs	6/4
which	85	Gs	1/9
Total Number of Items = 16			

Note: No items in this list were *Restricted* in any of the ten usage books. For each item, the number of usage books *Not Treating* (N) and the number *Accepting* (A) are shown. Figures are separated by a slash. For definition of terms *Not Treating*, etc., see p. 107. For a key to the symbols in the column headed *Category*, see Table 1, p. 23.

these items classify them as *Restricted*, but not all usage books treat them. The AHD Usage Panel acceptance votes on these items range, as is the case in almost every category or combination of categories, from the very lowest to near the very highest – from 0 to 93 percent; about two-thirds of the AHD votes are of 50 percent or less, one-third of more than 50 percent. No correlation can be seen with the findings of the ten usage books. In 34 percent of the possible cases, items on this list are adjudged *Restricted* by the usage books, in 66 percent of the cases they are *Not Treated*. There are only two items, already discussed, which nine of the ten usage books agree should be *Restricted* – *ain't* (a, b) ; only two items which eight usage books agree should be *Restricted* – *while* (c) and *either*; and seven items which seven books agree should be *Restricted* – *disinterested, each* (a), *farther* (b), *few* (a, b, c), and *transpire*. AHD Panel votes on the eleven items on which seven or more usage books agree are *Restricted* are low, ranging from 1 to 38 percent; this represents one of the few instances in which a correlation can be shown between AHD Panel opinion and the opinion of other experts, but the number of items is so small as not to effect generalizations to the contrary about the entire body of items voted on.

Nine items in the 106 items in this "combination" category fall in the same "combination" category in the dictionaries studied: *bad* (c), *between* (b), *drunk, each* (a), *ever, kind* (c), *reverend, type* (a), and *wish*. As the dictionaries have only 19 items in this combination category, this represents almost one-half the items so treated in the dictionaries. Eight of the nine shared items receive AHD Panel acceptance votes of 38 percent or less – another instance of partial agreement among AHD, the dictionaries, and the usage books. The great difference in number of items in this category – 19 in the dictionaries and 106 in the usage books – confirms the judgment expressed earlier that usage books do not enter non-problems. Items entered in usage books are far more likely to be adjudged *Restricted* than items entered in dictionaries.

Of the 318 items on which an AHD Usage Panel vote is reported, only 14 are treated in all ten usage books. Table 28 lists those items which are entered and adjudged either *Accepted* or *Restricted* in all ten usage books. The 14 items have AHD Panel acceptance votes of from 8 to 70 percent. Of the votes reported on these 14 items, only four are above 50 percent – *between* (a), and, in speech only, *bad* (b), and *who* (a, b). Less than 50 percent of the Panel accept any of these 14 items, except *between* (a), in writing. Of the total number of possible reactions to these 14 items by the 10 usage books (14 × 10 = 140), 56 or 40 per-

TABLE 27

USAGES EITHER *NOT TREATED* OR *RESTRICTED* BY TEN USAGE BOOKS

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY	N/R	ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY	N/R
about	40fw	Im	8/2	flaunt	09	Dc	5/5
ain't (a)	01w,16s	Gv	1/9	follow	22	Gs	7/3
(b)	01sw	Gv	1/9	fortuitous	15	Dc	5/5
alibi (a)	41w	Dx	6/4	gambit	63	Dx	7/3
all	39	Im	8/2	gift	06	Fs	8/2
appreciate	47	Dx	9/1	good (a)	00w,27s	Ga	5/5
bad (c)	08w,25s	Ga	5/5	(b)	14w,27s	Ga	5/5
badly	88	Dx	8/2	graduate (b)	07	Iv	6/4
better	31w	Dx	9/1	head	15	Iv	9/1
between (b)	01w,04s	Gp	6/4	hopefully	44	Dx	6/4
boast	55	Dx	9/1	host	18	Fs	9/1
burgeon	49	Dx	8/2	identify (a)	93	Dx	9/1
celebrant	51	Dx	7/3	(b)	57	Im	9/1
claim	69w	Dx	5/5	individual (a)	55	Dx	4/6
cohort	31f	Dx	6/4	(b)	47	Dx	4/6
condition	74	Dx	9/1	(c)	38	Dx	4/6
debut	07vi,03vt	Fs	8/2	infer	08	Dc	4/6
definite	71	Dx	6/4	insignia (b)	56	Gn	8/2
develop	67	Dx	9/1	internecine	91	Dx	7/3
disinterested	07	Dc	3/7	kind (c)	76	Gs	8/2
done	53	Dx	9/1	materialize	33	Dx	6/4
dope (a)	86w	Dx	8/2	mighty	11w,56s	Dx	6/4
drunk	17	Gs	5/5	nauseous	12	Dc	7/3
each (a)	05	Gs	3/7	negotiate	46w	Dx	9/1
(b)	69	Gs	5/5	noun	29-87	Gs	6/4
either	08	Gs	2/8	O.K.	20-57	Fs	6/4
enthuse (a)	24	Fb	5/5	outside	16	Ip	5/5
(b)	28	Fb	5/5	personality	43fw	Dx	9/1
escape	26	Iv	9/1	practically (a)	51	Dx	7/3
ever	26	Dc	6/4	(b)	46	Dx	8/2
farther (b)	33	Dc	2/8	quick	10w	Ga	8/2
fault	48	Fs	9/1	quite (d)	61w	Dx	6/4
few (a)	23	Gs	3/7	quiz (a)	56w	Dx	8/2
(b)	33	Gs	3/7	(b)	43w	Dx	8/2
(c)	32	Gs	3/7	quote	16	Fs	6/4

rattle	86 "serious w"	Dx	9/1	tend	20fw	Dc	7/3
regard	37	Dc	9/1	through	75w	Dx	7/3
rendition	69fw	Dx	8/2	thusly	03	Fd	4/6
renege	11w	Dx	9/1	too	20w	Im	9/1
replica	47	Dx	6/4	transpire	38	Dx	3/7
responsible	00	Dx	8/2	trek	78w	Dx	7/3
reverend (b)	44	Im	5/5	tribute	69	Dx	9/1
rile	30	Da	9/1	trigger	77	Dx	7/3
saving	87w	Gn	9/1	try (b)	59w	Fs	9/1
senior citizen	79w	Da	7/3	tycoon	90w	Dx	8/2
simultaneous	78	Ga	9/1	type (a)	06	Ip	5/5
so	75w	Im	4/6	unexceptional	13	Dc	8/2
sometime	06	Dx	9/1	upcoming	29	Dx	9/1
sound	16	Dx	8/2	various	09	Fs	9/1
spell	69	Dx	9/1	while (c)	37	Dx	2/8
spiral	74w	Dx	9/1	win	33w	Fs	9/1
stall (a)	60	Dx	9/1	wish	39	Dc	9/1
suffer	70	Iv	9/1	Xmas	12	S	6/4

Total Number of Items = 106

Note: No items in this list were *Accepted* in any of the ten usage books. For each item, the number of usage books *Not Treating* (N) and the number *Restricting* (R) are shown. Figures are separated by a slash. For definition of terms *Not Treated*, etc., see p. 107. For a key to the symbols in the column headed *Category*, see Table 1, p. 23.

cent of the reactions result in a judgment that the item is *Accepted.* In those cases in which a majority of the usage books adjudge the item *Accepted* – *author, between* (a), *prove, provided* – AHD Panel votes range from 19 to 70 percent.

Only two items in Table 28 – *due* and *like* (b) – are also in the "combination" category *Accepted/Restricted* in the nine dictionaries studied, this despite the fact that 77 items are so treated by the dictionaries. Where a roughly comparable relationship exists in the number of items similarly classified in the dictionaries and the usage books – 16 items classified *Not Treated/Accepted* in the usage books and 68 in the dictionaries – fully one-half the items on the usage book list are also on the dictionary list. The difference is curious, but, as such small numbers of items are involved, no significance can be drawn from it. The AHD Panel acceptance vote on *due* is 16 percent; the nineteen works consulted divide almost evenly on *due,* ten classifying it *Accepted,* nine *Restricted.* For *like* (b), the AHD Panel vote is 25 percent acceptance; five of the nineteen works classify it *Accepted,* fourteen *Restricted.* Despite an occasional partial consistency of reaction as shown in the treatment of *like* (b), no general correlation exists among the judgments on these 14 items by the AHD Usage Panel, the nine dictionaries, and the ten usage books.

Almost one-half the items on the AHD list do not fall into any of the categories or combinations of categories discussed up to now. Each of the 152 items not listed in Tables 25 to 28 receives all three possible treatments in the ten usage books – *Not Treated/Accepted/Restricted*; each item is placed in each category by at least one usage book. No table is presented of those 152 items, as they present such a diversity of opinion and mixtures of opinion that no common thread can be found running through their treatment. Almost every possible combination of books and numbers of books taking each position can be found. A typical item in this group is *intrigue*. In five of the usage books it is *Not Treated* – Leonard, Bryant, Follett, Crisp, and Perrin; in two – Evans and Copperud – it is *Accepted*; and it is *Restricted* in the remaining three – Krapp, Nicholson, Bernstein.

TABLE 28

USAGES EITHER *ACCEPTED* OR *RESTRICTED* BY TEN USAGE BOOKS

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY	A/R
author	19	Fs	7/3
bad (b)	39w,55s	Ga	3/6
between (a)	70	Dx	8/2
data	50	Gn	3/7
different (b)	17	Im	2/8
due	16	Dc	4/6
like (b)	25	Gs	2/8
only (a)	"specifies precise placement"	Gs	2/8
prove	27	Gv	6/4
provided	36	Im	7/3
try (a)	21w	Im	4/6
who (a)	13fw,66s	Gp	3/7
(b)	08w,59s	Gp	3/7
(c)	11w,17s	Gp	2/8

Total Number of Items = 14

Note: No items in this list were *Not Treated* in any of the ten usage books. For each item, the number of usage books *Accepting* (A) and the number *Restricting* the usage (R) are shown. Figures are separated by a slash. For definition of terms *Accepted*, etc., see p. 107. For key to symbols in column headed *Category*, see Table 1, p. 23.

Intrigue presents a typical array in more than a general sense. Even the position taken by each usage book on *intrigue* is typical. Evans and Copperud, the least conservative, accept the usage; Krapp, Nicholson, and Bernstein, the most conservative, restrict it. The other five, in which *intrigue* is *Not Entered*, cover significantly fewer of the total number of items than do the five which take a position on the usage.

The preceding discussion of treatment by the ten usage books of items separated into various categories and combinations of categories has revealed a general lack of correlation with AHD Panel judgments on those items. An analysis of combined performance by the ten usage books confirms that general impression. Table 29 provides totals of items in each of the three categories. The totals reveal that in 1,877 or 59 percent of the possible opportunities for reaction to items voted on by the AHD Usage Panel, the ten usage books did not even treat the item; in 418 or 13 percent of the cases the usage books accepted the usage; in 885 or 28 percent of the cases, the item was entered and restricted. Removing from consideration the three scholarly studies – Leonard, Bryant, Crisp – changes the percentages to 50 percent *Not Treated*, 15 percent *Accepted*, and 35 percent *Restricted.*

The equivalent totals for the nine dictionaries are 872 or 30 percent *Not Treated*, 1,410 or 50 percent *Accepted*, and 580 or 20 percent *Restricted*. If, on the grounds of their failure to take a position on most usages, the three recent Merriam-Webster dictionaries are removed from consideration, the figures become 583 or 30 percent *Not Treated*, 774 or 41 percent *Accepted*, and 551 or 29 percent *Restricted*. These percentages, even when the scholarly studies and the Merriam-Webster dictionaries are removed on the grounds that their presence might present a distorted picture of general performance in the making of usage judgments, show a striking similarity. The usage books find 35 percent of the items *Restricted*, the dictionaries 29 percent. Because, as has been pointed out above, usage books typically do not enter items not regarded as problems, the differences between dictionaries and usage books in percentages of items in the categories *Not Entered* and *Accepted* are meaningless.

TABLE 29

TREATMENT BY TEN USAGE BOOKS OF 318 USAGES ON WHICH AN AHD USAGE PANEL VOTE IS REPORTED

Usage Book	Not Treated	Accepted	Restricted	Total
Krapp	175	24	119	318
Leonard	262	10	46	318
Nicholson	146	29	143	318
Evans	120	117	81	318
Bryant	234	33	51	318
Copperud	143	77	98	318
Bernstein	134	32	152	318
Follett	203	24	91	318
Crisp	257	36	25	318
Perrin	203	36	79	318
TOTAL	1877	418	885	3180

Although the percentages of items on which usage books and dictionaries agree are strikingly similar, that similarity must not be interpreted as indicating that they agree on individual items in any significant way. It must be remembered that there are *no* items which all dictionaries and all usage books accept, and none which they all restrict. The largest number of items on which they "agree" in the sense that the items fall in the same category or combination category in the preceding analysis is nine. Except for the three items in the single category *Not Treated*, all those agreements are in "combination" categories, and the numbers of dictionaries and usage books placing each item in each category within those combinations differ.

Combining in a different way the totals just discussed produces a final statistic relevant to the comparison of treatment of the items under discussion in the AHD, in the ten usage books, and in the nine dictionaries. It is reasonable to assume that the AHD regards each of the 318 locutions on which a Panel vote is reported as at least a potential usage problem, as demonstrated by the discussion of each locution in a usage note. The ten usage books acknowledge those 318 usages to be possible usage problems in only 41 percent of the cases. Combining *Accepted* and *Restricted* findings for all ten books on 318 problems yields this percentage. The 318 items are *Not Treated* in any of the ten usage books in 59 percent of the possible cases. In other words, the 318 locutions are not even acknowledged as potential problems in three out of five cases. If the three scholarly studies are removed from consideration, the percentages become 50 percent acknowledged, 50 percent not acknowledged. In only one-half of the possible cases do the usage books even acknowledge that a potential problem exists.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The claim to authoritativeness and accuracy made by the authors of the ten usage books range from a claim based on the use only of direct observation of practice in language, as in Bryant, through claims based on the efficacy of a broad sampling of opinion, as in Leonard and Crisp, and on the sampling of published opinions, as in Perrin, to claims based on personal expertise and on "caring about" language as in Krapp, Evans, Nicholson, Bernstein, Copperud, and Follett. No persuasive case can be made for accepting as authoritative and accurate the body of judgments, decisions, opinions, recommendations made in any of the ten usage books.

On the whole, the judgments expressed in Bryant seem no more objective or consistent with actual usage than do those in other works not based on some direct observation of usage. Bryant's data are uneven in coverage, and possibly in accuracy; they are clearly not consistent in kind or amount from one item to the next. The judgments expressed can hardly be more reliable than the data. The combined opinions of experts and language users offered in Leonard and Crisp produce judgments having no greater claim to reliability or objectivity than those expressed in the AHD usage notes. The polling conducted by Leonard and Crisp occurred in a calmer, less contentious, less "let's show those permissive bastards" atmosphere, and probably the results are the more reasonable for that, but in the final analysis they represent only a collection of opinions, a homogenized agglomeration of whims and crotchets.

The reporting in Perrin of both usage and opinions about usage could furnish a model for a truly useful and dependable kind of statement about individual usages. However, more precise information about occurrences of locutions in different styles and levels of language, and more discriminating and accurate characterizations of those who object, or who might object, to a given usage are needed before statements based on the Perrin model can become fully expressive of the complexities of language variation and of reactions to language.

Unlike Bryant, Leonard, Crisp, and Perrin, in which the data from which conclusions are drawn are more or less explicitly stated, Krapp claims personal authority as the sole basis for judgment and nowhere acknowledges any other source of data or opinion. The inadequacy of personal opinion, even a wide sample of personal opinions, has already been discussed. Nicholson's Americanization of the fountainhead work of popular usage books, Fowler, succeeds only partially. It has most of the limitations of the original Fowler and only a modicum of added strength. Many of the entries maintain the waspish, if witty, tone of the original. Nicholson's use of sources, a strength, is spotty. Her furnishing of examples of approved usage in place of Fowler's exclusive reliance on instances of flawed usage represents an improvement, but on balance the judgments offered must be regarded as those of one, or at most two, persons.

Evans and Copperud consult, and occasionally refer to in their entries, a variety of sources, usually secondary, but are candid in stating that the opinions expressed are their own, regarding, as do most of the authors of usage books, their own tastes and preferences as the surest guide to good language. Follett and Bernstein, of the moderns, make the least pretense to the use of external sources of information, returning unabashedly to the *ipse dixit* stance made fashionable a generation earlier by Fowler. They assert, more stridently and aggressively than Fowler, their own authority, knowledge, experience, and perceptiveness as the source of their judgments.

The suggestion of a return to an earlier style of approach to usage is supported by other facts. The "conservatism" ratings discussed above show that Bernstein, one of the more lately published of the works studied, is exactly as conservative as Krapp, the earliest published. In the analysis of dictionaries, it was found that the earlier published dictionaries, W2 and NWD1, were quite conservative, but the later SCD and the even later AHD are nearly equally so.

A most interesting question arises in the examination of claims to authoritativeness. When bibliographies or lists of works consulted are checked in the ten usage guides, it appears that often the author of one guide consults, in addition to the expected dictionaries, the opinions of the authors of others, and uses those opinions as at least a partial basis for his own pronouncements. Perrin, as has been mentioned, lists Bryant, Evans, Fowler, and Marckwardt as sources. Bernstein lists Bryant, Copperud, Evans, Fowler, Perrin, to mention only those works discussed here. Follett, perhaps a more rugged authoritarian, cites only Fowler. The question raised by this practice of cross-citation is whether this rather incestuous practice may not result in the magnification of inaccuracies through repetition, especially when little attention is paid to what is actually happening in the use of language. This study does not attempt to answer the question; it cannot, as it has as data only information which possibly suffers from the inbreeding suggested.

The potential effects upon usage books of inbreeding of the sort described can be clearly seen in a work mentioned earlier in this chapter, but not included in the works analyzed. Roy H. Copperud's *American Usage: The Consensus*, unlike any work analyzed here, treats nearly all of the 318 items voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel. If it is remembered that even the most recent unabridged dictionary, W3, has no reference to 55 of those items and that none of the ten usage books treats as many as 200, the inclusion of all except a few in a recently published work seems curious. In the "Preface" to *Consensus*, Copperud explains the reason for their inclusion. It is *because* they are treated in AHD.

> The test that was used for inclusion of a point in this book is its appearence in two or more of the works compared. This not only fulfills the declared purpose of this book as offering the consensus, but also insures that the points taken up are significant enough to have been noticed by more than one authority. Obviously prevalent errors that have been dealt with by only one authority have been included, however.[1]

The "escape clause" at the end of this statement, it should be noted, gives Copperud the license claimed by every red-blooded usage book compiler – the right to decide when a problem exists – even if no one else, or only one other "authority," thinks so.

The works from which *Consensus* draws entries and opinions include many, but not all, of the works studied here, both usage books and dictionaries: Bernstein, Bryant, Copperud, Evans, Follett. Perrin in the usage books; W3, RHD and RHCD, AHD, SCD, NWD2 among the dictionaries. Also consulted are Rudolf Flesch, *The ABC of Style*[42] and the second edition, revised by Sir Ernest Gowers, of Fowler. Several other dictionaries are also consulted. Selection of items on the grounds of their being treated in one or more of the above works results, obviously, in the kind of inbreeding suggested above. In effect, *usage problem* comes to be defined as "locution referred to as such in two or more usage books or dictionaries on a selected list of such works."

In arriving at what it terms consensus on usage problems, the work treats every opinion as of equal validity and gives each opinion equal weight. The AHD Usage Panel is counted as approving or accepting a usage if 51 percent or more of the Panel accept it. The analysis of AHD Panel votes presented in the preceding chapter shows that there is no basis for such an evaluation. Consensus is declared on the acceptance or rejection of a usage when more than half the sources in which reference to that usage is found unite in approval or rejection. The number of sources cited and polled for each consensus decision varies considerably, ranging from two to as many as ten. Occasionally a judgment is offered, not labeled as a consensus, based on a statement in one work only.

The method of arriving at decisions about usages which is followed in *Consensus* is only superficially open-minded and based on objective data. The selection of items is "stacked"; the method of determining when one of the authorities, the AHD Usage Panel, approves or rejects a usage is insupportable; the counting of opinions from sources of varying reliability as equal to each other is naive; and the assumption that if more than half the sources consulted agree such agreement constitutes the ultimate "truth" about a locution is both indefensible and misleading. Because its major organizing principle is the ultimate expression of the inbreeding characteristic of a number of the works analyzed in this study, Copperud's *Consensus* constitutes the *reductio ad absurdum* of usage dictionaries which depend on opinion as a basis for judgment.

The specialized studies of usage and guides to usage which we have analyzed in the preceding pages are usually more informative than regular dictionaries in the treatment of usage problems. They often offer more historical or other background, more discussion of options, more examples, and, especially in the case of the more scholarly studies, more supporting data for judgments. They usually avoid the oversimplification involved in the application of one-word restrictive labels, the practice in which regular dictionaries often go astray. The usage guides and studies cannot, however, be said to be more objective or more reliable than dictionaries. As was true of the nine dictionaries studied, every analysis made of the handling by these ten usage books of the items voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel finds the usage books in disagreement with each other and with the dictionaries more often than in agreement. They are approximately as consistent — or inconsistent — as dictionaries in their judgments on individual locutions. They are often more amusing to read, but each is flawed or idiosyncratic in a way which makes its judgments suspect, thereby weakening its claims to accuracy and authoritativeness.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION: CONSENSUS, OPINION VERSUS USE, A PROPOSAL

An analysis has been made of the treatment in twenty works, including the AHD itself, of 318 locutions identified in the AHD as potential usage problems. All twenty works have been found to claim objectivity and authoritativeness in their evaluation of usage variants. The 318 locutions on which AHD Usage Panel votes are reported were chosen as a body of items for comparison of treatment for two reasons: (1) they represent locutions deemed questionable by the editors of AHD, self-identified as devoted to providing intelligent, up-to-date guidance in usage for modern American speakers and writers; (2) the members of the Usage Panel whose judgments of these usages are reported in the AHD usage notes are experts in the use of language who care deeply for the maintenance of precision and elegance in language.

It was hoped that careful analysis of the treatment of these 318 locutions in other works asserting expertise and authoritativeness in matters of usage would reveal some underlying strain or strains of consistency in the treatment of the usages in question in all the works examined, or, lacking that, some consistency among smaller, more homogeneous groups of works on usage. Neither has been found. Instead, this study has become a problem in the orderly documentation of chaos. Except in the treatments of very small sets of items in very small numbers of the dictionaries or usage books examined, no consistency has been found, and the failure of consistency to manifest itself has led to the unavoidable rejection of the claims to objectivity of any and all of the works analyzed.

The breadth in the diversity of treatment of the 318 items among the dictionaries and among the usage guides and studies has been presented and discussed in the two preceding chapters. A final analysis of the treatment of the items in the whole group of works, dictionaries and usage books together, serves only to confirm previous findings.

Table 30 gives the number and percentage of the 318 items which in the nineteen works — nine dictionaries and ten usage books – fall into three simple categories – *Not Treated, Accepted,* and *Restricted* – and four combinations of those categories, established earlier.[1] Comparable figures for dictionaries only are shown in Table 15, p. 72; for usage books only in Table 24, p. 107. The most significant finding revealed in Table 30 is that an overwhelming majority of the items – 278 or 87 percent – show no consistency of treatment in the nineteen works. Each of these 278 items is treated in each of three possible ways in at least one of the nineteen works analyzed. Three items *are* treated – really *not* treated – with consistency in all the nineteen works; they are *Not Treated* in any of the nineteen: *anyone, important,* and *leave* (b).

Only five items, 2 percent of the total, are treated in all nineteen works, as shown in Table 31. Those five items are not, however, placed in the same category in all nineteen works. They are either *Accepted* or *Restricted,* with the number of works accepting or restricting their use bearing no apparent relationship to the percentage of AHD Panel members who approve or reject them. Votes by AHD Panel members range from 16 percent to 70 percent approval for these five items. There are 95 possibilities of acceptance or restriction by 19 works of five items (19 × 5 = 95); in 70 of those possible cases, or 74 percent, the item in question is *Accepted*; in 25, or 26 percent, of the possible instances *Restricted.* The highest proportion of acceptance is for the item receiving the highest AHD Usage Panel vote, *between* (a), and the lowest proportion of acceptance is for the item receiving the lowest Panel vote, *due.* But there is no consistent relationship between proportion of acceptance and AHD Panel vote for the other items.

Table 32 lists seventeen items which are *Accepted* in all the dictionaries and usage books in which they are treated, but are *Not Treated,* do not appear, in some dictionaries and usage books. AHD Panel votes on these items cover almost the full range, from 9 percent to 96 percent approval, with almost two-thirds of the votes indicating approval by more than one-half the Panel. As all of these items, when treated at all in the nineteen works, are *Accepted,* it would appear at first that there is some fairly extensive consistency between AHD Panel votes and the judgments expressed in the other works. Close examination reveals that four items are *Accepted* in more than one-half the nineteen works: *agenda* (a, b), *none, presently* (a); AHD Panel votes on these four items range from 59 to 86 percent approval. Otherwise, item-by-item examination reveals only a random relationship between the size of the AHD Panel approval vote and the number of works in which an item is listed and *Accepted.* Of the 323 possible treatments of items (19 works × 17 items = 323), in 187 (58 percent) of the cases an item is *Not Treated,* in 136 (42 percent) it is *Accepted.*

TABLE 30

318 AHD USAGE ITEMS CLASSIFIED AS TO TREATMENT BY NINETEEN DICTIONARIES AND USAGE BOOKS

Classification	Number of Items	Percentage of Total
Not Treated (N)	3	01
Accepted (A)	0	00
Restricted (R)	0	00
Either Not Treated or Accepted (N/A)	17	05
Either Not Treated or Restricted (N/R)	15	05
Either Accepted or Restricted (A/R)	5	02
Either Not Treated, Accepted, or Restricted (N/A/R)	278	87
TOTAL	318	

Note: For explanation of classifications, see p. 107. Comparable figures for dictionaries taken alone appear in Table 15, p. 72; for usage books taken alone in Table 24, p. 107.

TABLE 31

USAGES EITHER *ACCEPTED* OR *RESTRICTED* BY NINETEEN DICTIONARIES AND USAGE BOOKS

Item	AHD Vote	Category	A/R
between (a)	70	Dx	17/2
data	50	Gn	12/7
due	16w	Dc	10/9
prove	27	Gv	15/4
provided	36	Im	16/3
Total Number of Items = 5			

Note: All items on this list were treated in all of the nineteen dictionaries and usage books. For each item the number of dictionaries and usage books *Accepting* (A) and *Restricting* (R) are shown, separated by a slash. For definition of terms *Accepted* and *Restricted* see p. 107. For key to symbols in the column headed *Category,* see Table 1, p. 23.

TABLE 32

USAGES EITHER *NOT TREATED* OR *ACCEPTED* BY NINETEEN DICTIONARIES AND USAGE BOOKS

ITEM	AHD VOTE	CATEGORY	N/A
agenda (a)	86	Gn	3/16
(b)	59	Gn	8/11
commentate	09vt,19vi	Fb	13/6
compensate	75	Dx	13/6
complete	67	Dw	17/2
cope	25fw	Iv	11/8
escalate	75	Fb	13/6
foremost	76	Dx	18/1
lack	42	Iv	16/3
most (b)	86w,96s	Dx	11/8
nicely	68	Dx	16/3
none	68	Gs	2/17
premiere	14	Fs	13/6
presently (a)	73	Dx	6/13
sick (a)	"slight pref."	Ip	14/5
though	39fw	Gs	10/9
which	85	Gs	3/14
Total Number of Items = 17			

Note: No items in this list were *Restricted* in any of the nineteen dictionaries and usage books. For each item the number of dictionaries and usage books *Not Treating* (N) and the number *Accepting* (A) are shown, separated by a slash. For definition of terms *Not Treated*, etc., see p. 107. For key to symbols in the column headed *Category*, see Table 1, p. 23.

A final grouping of items according to treatment in all nineteen works, shown in Table 33, reveals that fifteen items are *Restricted* in all the works which enter them; they are *Not Treated* in all others. These fifteen items receive AHD Panel acceptance votes ranging from 0 to 87 percent. In 204 (72 percent) of the 285 possible cases (19 works × 15 items = 285), the items are *Not Treated*; in only 81 or 28 percent of the cases are they *Restricted.* Only three items receive AHD Usage Panel votes of greater than 50 percent approval: ***each*** (b), ***kind*** (c), and ***noun***. All the rest are approved by fewer than 50 percent of the Panel members, but no correlation can be found between the degree or strength of Panel rejection, as shown by the low percentage of approval, and the number of the nineteen works in which the item in question is *Restricted.* In fact, the item receiving the lowest AHD Panel vote, 0 percent approval for *simultaneous* as an adverb, is treated and restricted in only one of the nineteen works; coincidentally or otherwise, that one work is by an AHD Panel member, Bernstein. In only four cases do more than one-half the nineteen works classify an item as *Restricted*: *bad* (c), *drunk, each* (a), and *reverend* (b). AHD Panel votes on these four items range from 5 to 37 percent approval. Other items receiving equally low AHD approval votes are *Restricted*, however, in as few as one of the nineteen works.

The analysis presented above of small sets of items treated in the same way (3 items), treated by all nineteen works (5 items), or, although not treated in all nineteen works, falling in the same category in the works in which they are treated (32 items) demonstrates the lack of agreement among the nineteen dictionaries and usage guides or studies. No recognizable consensus emerges from any of the comparisons which have been made. The "authorities" are not in agreement either as to which items consti-

TABLE 33

USAGES EITHER *NOT TREATED* OR *RESTRICTED* BY NINETEEN DICTIONARIES AND USAGE BOOKS

Item	AHD Vote	Category	N/R
bad (c)	08w,25s	Ga	9/10
between (b)	01w,04s	Gp	11/8
drunk	17w	Gs	9/10
each (a)	05	Gs	9/10
(b)	69	Gs	14/5
ever	26	Dc	14/5
follow	22	Gs	16/3
kind (c)	76	Gs	16/3
materialize	33	Dx	15/4
noun	29 to 87	Gs	15/4
regard	16	Dc	18/1
reverend (b)	37	Im	7/12
simultaneous	00	Ga	18/1
suffer	06	Iv	18/1
wish	39	Dc	15/4
Total Number of Items = 15			

Note: No items in this list were *Accepted* in any of the nineteen dictionaries and usage books. For each item the number of dictionaries and usage books *Not Treating* (N) and the number *Restricting* (R) are shown, separated by a slash. For definition of terms *Not Treated*, etc., see p. 107. For key to symbols in the column headed *Category*, see Table 1, p. 23.

tute potential usage problems or as to whether those potential usage problems are actual problems — locutions which should be avoided by "careful" or "precise" or "correct" or "elegant" speakers or writers.

It remains to inquire why the experts, the obviously intelligent, devoted, highly literate body of lexicographers, linguists, belletrists, editors, and teachers of English responsible for the judgments we have been analyzing, are so seldom in agreement. Why, if the opinions of such groups are really authoritative, is there so little agreement on such a small number of items?

Opinion versus Use

A part of the answer to the problem presented by the inconsistency of opinions by authorities on usage is, unintentionally, I am sure, suggested by a usage note in AHD.

> *Flaunt* in the sense of *flout* (to show contempt or conspicuous disregard for) is rejected by 91 percent of the Usage Panel. A dissenting member of Panel observes that it is "in too general use to be ignored." However, although its appearance in print since the 1930's (especially in the United States) is widely attested, *flaunt* in this sense remains a malapropism in the judgment of most writers and editors.

The conviction underlying this pronouncement, put in the baldest terms, runs something like the following: "Use of a locution by numbers of writers in well-edited publications renders it suitable for use by others, except when, because we dislike it, we 'writers and editors' wish to condemn it. If we condemn it, it is unsuitable." In fact, such condemnations, if voiced frequently and vigorously enough, usually carry great weight among individuals aspiring to recognition as members of a well-educated, highly literate elite. The locutions singled out for disapprobation continue to be regarded as "incorrect" or "nonstandard" or "informal" or deserving of some such label until use of the locution becomes so widespread that it overwhelms the opinions. Then the opinions are only ruefully and regretfully surrendered, often with a hint that the surrender may presage the dissolution of the language.

Two examples should suffice. On the maintaining of a distinction between *celebrant* and *celebrator*, Copperud in *Consensus* reports that he "acknowledges the difference but fears it is being done in by careless interchange of the terms, a view that is supported by current dictionary definitions." In the same work, he reports of *cohort* in the sense of "colleague" or "companion" that "popular acceptance is carrying the field," a martial metaphor which reflects the contentiousness and sense of embattlement with which strong prescriptive views on usage are often held.

The same sense of regret, sometimes waxing to an almost angry despair, is expressed in a number of the letters received by Crisp from participants in his survey.[2] Some respondents indicated that they had marked some locutions as being in widespread use in colloquial or literary English but that they personally found the usages deplorable and reprehensible. The issue raised by such comments is quite clear. If the evidence of use shows that a locution is widely used by reputable writers or speakers in presumably careful expression of their ideas, yet some who have a claim to expertise – editors, writers, teachers of English, usage "experts" – object to that locution, which is to prevail, use or opinion?

The conviction implicit in the usage note on *flaunt* from the AHD, reprinted above, is a contemporary expression of an American view expressed most undisguisedly by Richard Grant White at the very end of the last century. White wrote, ". . . authority of general usage, or even of the usage of great writers, is no absolute in language. There is a misuse of words which can be justified by no authority, however great, and by no usage, however general."[3] White's view continues to be held today; although some who hold that view attempt to qualify or soften it in their statement of it, they actually assert that opinion is a more authoritative guide to usage than is use. Often the proponents of that view indicate that the only alternative to a sensitive, perceptive opinion (their own) is a count of the accidents of speech and writing found in the language of the masses. Wilson Follett counterposes his opinions to the language of "the illiterate and heedless."[4] Bernstein says that those who challenge his judgments propose as an alternate authority "the unclear, imprecise, and often vulgar voice of the masses."[5] Sheridan Baker, an academic proponent of the primacy of opinion, sets up the same alternatives when he suggests that only opinion or preference, not use, places an adequate value on what he terms the "cognitive" function of language.

> Accurate description is still what we want of any dictionary. But we want that dictionary to take into its account all the available evidence, from whatever direction, particularly from the subjectivity of language, that has previously been excluded on theory and allowed back in only grudgingly and partially. We want a dictionary deeply aware of the cognitive function of language, aware that the thoughtful preferences of the writer have more cognitive, intellectual, and even more social weight than the thoughtless accidents of speech, which may yield a higher count. We want a dictionary sensitive to the thoughtful and cognitive preferences of language at its best—that is, to language as thought, which probably crystallizes at its best only in the crucible of writing.[6]

Marckwardt, in "Lexicographical Method and the Usage Survey," takes a somewhat more judicious view of the place and value of the reporting of opinion, specifically in dictionary treatment of usage. Of the AHD practice of reporting the votes of a Usage Panel in usage notes, Marckwardt says, ". . . it has the virtue of recognizing that attitude toward words and expressions is a part of their history, and as such is a legitimate and indeed an inescapable concern of the lexicographer."[7] Marckwardt in no way implies that if opinion differs from use then opinion should be taken as authoritative. Earlier in the same article Marckwardt suggests an issue which is possibly crucial in discussion of the applicability and value of opinion in making judgments on usage. He contrasts the occupations, hence the preoccupations, of the groups designated as experts on usage in RHD and in AHD. Of the composition of the AHD Panel he says,

> What is significant here is the shift from the emphasis on editors and teachers of the *Random House Dictionary* to professional speakers and writers. The former group is preoccupied with language in an essentially critical manner; they pass judgment on the language of others. The concern of the latter group is purely creative and personal; to the extent that their opinions and attitudes are operative, they are centered about the language they employ themselves.[8]

The questions suggested by the issue of difference in group makeup which Marckwardt discusses are quite important, and usually more or less avoided in discussions of the value of opinion.

Whose opinions matter? To whom? How much do they matter? What risks does the writer take who uses a locution in ignorance or defiance of opinions of this kind? Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., in a review of the RHD, gives it tongue-in-cheek praise for telling "who will hurt you if you make a mistake."[9] A much more important question, however, is "Why will they hurt you?" Typically, the answer offered by the experts on usage is that they wish to punish those who violate the purity, the precision, the elegance, the tradition, the logic, or the grammaticalness of the language. Those "reasons" are rejected by some as rationalizations.

Allen Walker Read has proposed a theory regarding the motivation shared by those who offer opinions on usage.

> Much of what happens in the field of usage is well explained by the outlook of the sociologist Thorstein Veblen. He pointed out in his "theory of conspicuous waste" that people gain prestige by spending time in acquiring an archaic spelling system and a classic form of the language. They set themselves off as an *elite* by their linguistic habits. I feel that this is what the purists are attempting to do, without realizing it. They are saying to the world, "Just look at the high state of our culture!"
>
> Some other purists are merely carrying on a trivial game. They have a little list of so-called mistakes, and they are overjoyed when they catch someone using a form that is on their list. It is like the children's game of "Beaver": the child that sees a man with a beard first is required to cry out "Beaver!" and he gets a point every time he says "Beaver." Dwight Macdonald, for instance, rings the changes on about a dozen words *(disinterested, infer* for *imply, complected*, and so on), and he cries "Beaver" whenever he finds one of them.[10]

An even harsher characterization of the motivations of usage experts is put forward by Robert A. Hall. In an article discussing the critics of W3, whom he calls "purists," Hall suggests historical and ideological backgrounds as well as psychological bases for insistence on the primacy of opinion.

> The puristic attitudes which beset our society are not inherent in the relation of language to the rest of human cultures; they are outgrowths of a specific period of West European history. Our traditional purism is compounded of Renaissance aristocratic prejudice, seventeenth-century French academism based on Richelieu's authoritarianism and Louis XIV's absolutism, and eighteenth-century English snobbery and social climbing. American culture has rejected these attitudes in most matters, and rightly so; that it has not done so until now in language is due to the huge, entrenched, vested interest in "correctness-mongering" that has been built up and has grown with the spread of universal education.
>
> Aside from mere ignorance of the facts, there are only three psychological bases for purism: sadism, masochism, and desire for personal aggrandizement. Authoritarianism in any field (including language matters) is based primarily on sadism, the desire to force one's will on others and to cause unhappiness while doing so; most purists are, consciously or unconsciously, sadists.[11]

It is not necessary to accept such pejorative ascriptions of motive in order to question seriously the value of opinion in matters of language use. All the data presented in this study have shown that opinions differ significantly on most questioned usages in the list from the AHD. Crisp, in his study of opinions on usage, working with over 700 "experts," found a similar lack of consistency in their opinions. AHD Usage Panel members, the most conservative group participating in the Crisp study, found 72 percent of the 230 locutions submitted for judgment to be either *Disputable* or *Nonstandard*; the least conservative group, the language specialists, placed only 41 percent in those two categories; the whole group of over 700 placed 57 percent in the two categories.[12] There is no obvious way of deciding with any assurance which set of opinions to follow, which to ignore.

Read quotes from a review of the AHD which suggests that a strictly logical response to a division of opinion on usage can lead only to the kind of *reductio ad absurdum* suggested earlier in reference to attempts to isolate a consensus on usage.

> There is a certain cynicism but strict reasoning in the conclusion of the logician Willard Quine (*New York Review of Books* 13:10:3, 4 Dec. 1969): "To use this dictionary as a guide to good usage simply avoid all the usages, perhaps 300 in number, that were brought to a vote at all; for to put a usage to a vote is to question it, and to question it is to prove it questionable."[13]

The Quine proposal suggests as a substitute for the dogma so deplored by purists — whatever is is right — a new dogma: whatever ____________________ questions is not to be used in standard English. The user, of course, can fill in the blank with AHD, Evans, Bernstein, or any other authority of his choice. If, however, more than one dictionary or usage book is taken into consideration, disagreement arises, and the disagreement cannot be resolved in any satisfactory way.

That one "expert" or a group of "experts" question or disapprove of a locution is not a satisfactory guide to usage. Every locution questioned or disapproved of in every dictionary or usage book I have examined is an instance of a regular, normal process or tendency in English, other instances of which occur and have occurred without arousing question or bringing down disapproval. The huge majority of extensions in word meaning, for instance, occur largely unremarked by any but lexicographers, who dutifully create a citation slip for each new use encountered. One of the more intriguing unsolved mysteries of the process of language change is the reason for the raising of objections to only some instances of a given process of change in English. It is simply not possible to tell with any certainty why one specific expression of a pervasive process is questioned or disapproved of and others are not.

The raising of a question about a locution or the expression of disapproval of a locution is, however, itself an observable and verifiable fact. Such questioning or expression of disapproval cannot be taken to mean that the locution in question is not used by many able and reputable speakers and writers, nor can it be offered as justification for a desire or an attempt to extirpate that word or phrase or structure from the language. But the raising of questions or the expression of disapproval *can* serve as the basis for a reliable, objective, authoritative guide to usage. Acknowledgement that a question has been raised is the first step in the method of arriving at judgments about usage which I wish to propose as a final part of this study.

A Proposal

No claim is made to originality in the general procedures for making judgments about usage which are here proposed. The basic techniques have been used before and the results published. The proposal deals specifically and in detail only with written usage. Both opinions and statistics are involved, the opinions as a guide to matters to be assessed, the statistical analyses as a basis for the making of reliable and useful statements on those matters.

The *Oxford English Dictionary*, as is well known, made the first semi-systematic large-scale attempt to base dictionary definitions on actual language use, relying most heavily on usage in literary works. The method of collection was unsystematic, however, with large numbers of relatively uncoordinated efforts taking place over a long period of time. J. Lesslie Hall in his *English Usage*, published in 1917, used as data for his conclusions "over 75,000 pages of English and American literature," by "about two hundred authors." His analyses resulted in statements such as "Found in 65 reputable authors 453 times."[14] Charles Carpenter Fries in his 1940 *American English Grammar*[15] surveyed the use of inflections, function words and word order in about 2,000 complete letters and excerpts from 1,000 more. Fries classified his correspondents as to social and educational background and studied intensively their use of certain grammatical forms and patterns.[16] Margaret M. Bryant's 1957 *Current American Usage*, described in detail earlier, also based conclusions on the examination of actual usage, but her samples of usage were drawn from many sources and were of varying size.

Each of the foregoing used the study of actual samples of language as the basis for statements about language – the method proposed here – but each is subject to some criticism as to either the size or nature of the sample of language used or the technique of examination.

In 1952, in an article entitled "Pronominal *This*: A Quantitative Analysis,"[17] Paul Roberts first outlined broadly the technique which is here recommended.

> . . . We want to know what the facts are, not what various people, however competent, think the facts may be. Is there no way to get at the facts?
>
> It happens that once we decide what English we are calling Standard English the facts are ascertainable and are not even very hard to ascertain. First we define the criterion of the standard. We are working on present-day, written, American English, and within these limits we may choose as exemplary whatever seems to us fit for emulation. Suppose we decide to report what is standard in nationally circulated "slick" and "quality" magazines. This standard will seem properly respectable to many readers; some, of course, will think it too high or too low.

To demonstrate his proposed technique, Roberts established a hypothetical "rule" – not so hypothetical actually, as a similar rule was and is found in some handbooks of usage: "The pronoun *this* should not be used with vague reference. That is, when it refers to something which precedes it, the antecedent must be a noun or noun-equivalent which may be substituted for the pronoun without injury to sense or idiom."[18]

Using all the nonfiction in a single issue each of *American Scholar, Atlantic Monthly, Harper's, McCall's, New Yorker,* and *Saturday Evening Post* as his sample of standard, contemporary, written American English, Roberts tested the hypothetical rule. His sample amounted to an estimated 220,000 words. He found 75 occurrences of observance of the "rule," 195 occurrences of violation of the rule – instance of "vague reference," that is – and 26 occurrences of *this* to which the rule did not apply. Occurrences of "vague reference" were between 60 and 80 percent in all magazines with, interestingly, the *Atlantic Monthly* having the highest individual percentage. Roberts' conclusion corresponds closely to the position taken in this study:

> Counting, I am aware, will not solve all problems, not even all handbook problems. But it will solve many, and it does seem absurd to argue about what the facts may be when it is possible to know what the facts are. If we were indeed writing a handbook of English usage and if we set down the information that in the national magazines pronominal *this* is generally used without a substantive antecedent, our readers might disapprove of our choice of standard, but they could not disagree with what we say about the standard. That is fact.[19]

Roberts' analysis produced separate figures for each of the magazines studied, and the reliability of the analysis was demonstrated by the striking similarity of results for each magazine.

When Roberts published his study of pronominal *this*, counting, as a technique for studying language, was in generally high repute. Many linguists were working at and being trained in techniques which, like that described by Roberts, involved the careful counting and analysis of occurrences of specific locutions or classes of locutions in finite samples of actual language, oral and written. The basis for statements in, as an outstanding example, the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada* project, is counting. Undertaken in 1931 under the directorship of Hans Kurath, contributed to both as fieldworkers and editors by many eminent linguists, and now being brought to conclusion for the Middle and South Atlantic States by Raven I. McDavid, Jr., the *Atlas* counts occurrences of vocabulary items, pronunciations, and forms and analyzes their geographic and social distribution.

The massive shift in direction in language study, beginning in the mid-fifties, to the more theoretical, less corpus-based techniques of transformational-generative grammar had the effect of making data-based studies unfashionable in the eyes of many. The subsequent criticism of W3's refusal to assign restrictive labels, which often took the form, as noted above, of accusing structural linguists of responsibility for the decision, perhaps intensified feelings of hostility toward data-based studies of language. At any rate, many of those who continued to see usefulness in statistical techniques became either unwilling or unable to find support for large-scale application of data-based techniques of the kind which rapid development and increase in accessibility of the computer had made possible.

One large-scale project continued, however, and it is the result of that project which makes a reliable approach to the study of written usage currently possible. Ironically, what is possibly the widest dissemination to the general public of information about the use of a computerized sample of written American English as a basis for lexicographic decisions occurs as part of the front matter of the AHD. Henry Kučera, co-author with W. Nelson Francis of the full and definitive description of what will be referred here to as the Brown Corpus,[20] in his essay in AHD, "Computers in Language Analysis and in Lexicography," describes the Brown University *Standard Corpus of Present-Day Edited American English*, available on punched cards or magnetic tape from the University.

> The Corpus contains a total of 1,014,232 running words and is divided into 500 samples, each approximately 2,000 words long. These 500 samples are distributed among 15 types, or genre categories, representing a wide range of subject matter and prose style (poetry and drama are not included), from the sports page of the newspaper to the scientific journal, and from popular romantic fiction to abstruse philosophical discussion. All of the selections constituting the Corpus were chosen by a random sampling procedure from texts first printed in the United States during a single calendar year.[21]

William Morris, editor in chief of the AHD, points out that during the stage of preparation for publication, ". . . through no special virtue of our own, we had become the first dictionary to have access to such a corpus." The staff of AHD, according to Morris, used the Brown Corpus as a source of information on word meaning, although such a small, selected corpus is obviously inadequate to the task of furnishing examples of all English words in all senses, as it contains only 50,406 different words; they also used the Corpus to "confirm preferred [spelling] choices statistically."[22] Morris makes no mention – predictably, I suppose – of any attempt to use the Corpus to verify or confirm other matters of divided or disputed usage. The ideological position of AHD would, of course, preclude such a practice. But it is precisely such a use of the Corpus which is proposed here.

When Roberts made his 1952 study of pronominal *this*, all the work was done by Roberts and his students "by hand," including the choosing of the sample. Twenty years later, Walter E. Meyers of North Carolina State University was able to investigate a large number of usages with far less expenditure of time or energy and probably with higher accuracy by using the Brown Corpus. Meyers published his results in an article entitled "A Study of Usage Items Based on an Examination of the Brown Corpus."[23] He outlines the advantages of the use of the Corpus for the study of usage.

> As a foundation of a usage study, the Corpus has four advantages: first of all, the usage being examined is contemporary. All the selections were printed in the United States in 1961—five hundred of them, each 2,000 words long. Second, the Corpus therefore contains over a million words. The study covers more data than most usage surveys. . . . Third, usage studies based on the Corpus are reliable—at least, their reliability can be verified. The computer, if programmed correctly, will locate each and every instance of the word or construction desired. . . . The format of the Corpus insures that its material is accessible and permanently available for re-examination or additional study.
>
> Finally, the Corpus is standard—standard in the sense that a measuring scale is standard. The samples in the Corpus cover a predetermined range of all varieties of edited American English, from press reportage to Westerns to learned articles. Accurate comparative studies will be possible for the firs ttime when other corpuses with the same range are compiled; the studies may be chronological, if corpuses for earlier or future dates are assembled; the studies may be geographical—a corpus for British English is presently being compiled.[24]

Meyers was able to analyze successfully twenty-nine items, twenty-one of which are among the 318 voted upon by the AHD Usage Panel. Some excerpts from his discussion of the *shall-will* "problem," a dead horse really, demonstrate the use of analysis of actual usage at its most effective.

> Too often one meets statements like this about *shall* and *will:* "Keep *shall* and *should* for *I* and *we*, and *will* and *would* for the others. Switch them to express determination. . . ."[10] Some handbooks would limit these distinctions to "strictly formal English; observing "these distinctions are weaker than they used to be, and *will* is increasingly used in all persons."[11] These qualifications are profound understatements. With all persons, in all styles, in all genres, in both declarations and questions, *will* far outnumbers *shall*. In the Corpus, *shall* occurs 267 times to 2,244 instances of *will*. Of all modal auxiliaries, *shall* is the least used by over four hundred occurrences (next is *might*, found 672 times).
>
> We might almost say that *shall* functions as a marker of legal jargon: nearly half the total occurrences are from laws, directives, and proclamations. . . . The word occurs thirty-seven times in quotations from earlier

> periods of the language, with the King James Bible as the most common source. . . . In current, non-legal American English, *will* occurs eighteen times as frequently as *shall*. . . .
>
> The Corpus findings, based on extensive data, are clear: there is no *shall-will* error.
>
> [10]Baker, p. 313.[25]
>
> [11]Floyd C. Watkins, William B. Dillingham, Edward T. Martin, *Practical English Handbook* (Boston: Houghton, 1970), p. 295.[26]

Quite clearly, the *shall-will* horse is ready for interment; with the exception of an acknowledgement of the preference for *shall* in legal and quasi-legal usage, no dictionary or usage book should even raise a question about the use of *will* "in place of" *shall.*

In a discussion of the uses of *rate* as a verb, Meyers demonstrates the precision and clarity of analysis made possible by the examination of occurrences of a criticized usage in a carefully controlled, standardized sample of actual language. The difference between what the AHD editors presented to the Usage Panel as two "meanings" of *rate*, one transitive and one intransitive, is shown clearly to be instead "a matter not of what meaning a particular word has, but whether English allows the use of a grammatically active verb to be either logically passive or logically active." A common example, indicating that English does do so, "can be seen from a verb like *grow*; compare:

> John grew a beard.
> John's beard grew."[27]

Meyers finds 13 examples of *rate* used as a verb in the Corpus. In seven cases, the uses are "congruent," either grammatically and logically active or grammatically and logically passive. In six cases, the uses are "noncongruent"; the verb is grammatically active but logically passive. One writer, it is discovered, uses the verb both congruently and noncongruently. Meyers' conclusion is clear. "Since half the examples of the word are noncongruent, the Brown Corpus furnished no support for objections to the usage."[28]

One final example from the Meyers study will suffice to show the superiority of an examination of actual use over well-educated opinion as a guide to usage.

> Sheridan Baker's words illustrate the comments about *anticipate* sometimes seen: "Do not use it to mean simply 'expect'; use *expect*. The most precise usage is in something like 'He anticipated the lob and moved back.' "[5] Thus,

the word should not be used in contexts where one looks forward to something, but restricted to those where one does something about it. . . .

Apparently this precision, or most of it, goes to waste, since American writers do not use the word in this way. The Corpus showed thirty-seven instances of *anticipate* as a verb, or *anticipation*, its nominal form. The, "precise" sense occurred only seven times out of the total number of contexts.

[5]Sheridan Baker, *The Complete Stylist* (New York: Crowell, 1966), p. 294.[29]

Another usage book standby bites the dust.

The examples presented above from Meyers' study show that the Brown Corpus can be efficiently and productively analyzed to determine the use in standard written English of verb forms (*shall-will*), of what on the surface, at least, appear to be shifts in "meaning" of verbs (*rate*) and cases of semantic extension or overlap (*anticipate*). Meyers also successfully assesses some problems in syntax – *split infinitive, none* as a plural; some problems he classifies as (the quotation marks are his) "faulty logic," such as the expression *better than*, anathematized in AHD, it will be remembered, by Dwight Macdonald (who turns out to be wrong on the basis of the evidence yielded by the Brown Corpus); and others.

Some kinds of disjunctive usages and usages involving words of a very high general frequency of occurrence, hence extensive differentiation in function, words like *to, the, of,* and the like, present problems or difficulties in efficient retrieval from the Corpus. Split infinitives, for instance, are not all retrieved, as Meyers has the computer programmed to point out only all instances of *to* followed by a word ending in *-ly*. Meyers is aware, of course, of the inadequacy of this particular sample.[30] There is no doubt, however, that more discriminating retrieval programs can be designed to yield a greater number of the split infinitives in the Corpus, and it is a certainty that any locution which can be precisely specified can be extracted for study.

A final demonstration in the Meyers study of the efficacy of employment of the Brown Corpus in the forming of conclusions about disputed or questioned usages is that, where it seems interesting or appropriate to do so, Meyers is able to identify the kind or kinds of writing to which a locution is restricted, or in which it occurs most frequently, or in which it behaves differently from the norm. In the *shall-will* discussion quoted above, he identifies legal language and older varieties of English as the predominant sources for occurrences of *shall*. In the discussion of *none* in plural uses, he can make the following statement.

> The distinction between singular and plural shows no preference dependent upon level of formality: plurals occur in the categories of Press Editorials, Belles Lettres, Popular Lore, Learned and Scientific Writing, and Science Fiction. We find nearly an equal division (six singular, four plural) between singular and plural in the category Belles Lettres, where we would expect writers to be most careful about their work.[31]

The classification and identification of selections in the Corpus in fifteen genre categories make such analyses easy to perform. It is a simple matter to verify whether a locution is — to use as an example a favored term of disdain by some usage experts — "journalese" by contrasting its occurrence in newspaper writing of various sorts with its use in other kinds of writing.

What is more, it is quite possible, should problems suggesting the necessity of such data arise, to develop additional corpuses. If there is need to confirm or test the significance of what appears to be a difference in the occurrence of a locution in, for instance, Belles Lettres as opposed to Learned and Scientific Writing, or as opposed to Press Editorials or any other of the genre categories, additional larger samples, selected in exactly the same way as the Brown Corpus samples, can be selected, entered into the computer, and analyzed. If equivalent samples of kinds of writing not identified or included in the Brown Corpus are wanted — for example, samples of student writing of a particular kind or kinds; samples of writing appearing in Black newspapers and magazines; of dialogue, actual or invented; in short of any kind of language which has been or is capable of being recorded — such samples can be secured and standardized. The techniques and the technology for doing so exist.

It must be emphasized that the judgments produced by the use of the Brown Corpus or of other corpuses to be developed are not the judgments of a computer but those of an examiner of language who, through the use of the materials entered into the computer, becomes a true expert in usage. Samples of a given locution are produced from the Corpus only upon request in the form of a program specifying precisely what locution is to be furnished, how much and what kind of surrounding context is wanted, and what additional classificatory or identifying information is to be supplied. Once a printout containing the requested data is produced, it must be examined item by item by the human examiner. The conclusions reached by Meyers are his own, arrived at after careful analysis of the set of occurrences delivered by the computer for each item studied. But the conclusions are based on fact, subject to verification, and to objective assessment of reliability.

Surely this is the only truly sound way of producing expert, authoritative statements about written usage.

APPENDIX 1

MASTER LIST

Note: For an explanation of the purpose and arrangement of items in *the Master List, see p.* —·—

EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS

The following explanatory remarks and lists of abbreviations used in the Master List are keyed by number to the indicated portion of the composite sample entry below.

COMPOSITE SAMPLE ENTRY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
above	(b):	as n,	"read the ...."	IN	Fs	A44

(8)	(9)	(10)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(8)	(9)	(10)
W2	N		RD	R*		Kr	N		Co	N	
W3	A		RC	R*		Le	N		Be	N	
C7	A		N1	A		Ev	N		Fo	R	commer
C8	A		N2	R	in	Ni	R	avoid	Cr	R	D/I
			Sc	R*	co	Br	A		Pe	R	avoid

(1) The entry word in AHD under which the usage note appears.

(2) If more than one locution or sample is voted on in the note, each separate one is indicated by a letter in parentheses—(a), (b), etc.

(3) If the part of speech of a word is relevant to the usage problem, the information is introduced by the word *as* followed by an abbreviation from the following list:

ad — adverb
aj — adjective
co — conjunction
n — noun
pn — pronoun
pp — past participle
pr — preposition
v — verb
vi — intransitive verb
vt — transitive verb

(4) The characterization of the usage problem involved; either a synonym or synonyms indicating the sense in which the item is questioned, or a brief example of the questioned use, or both. In examples, the entry word is often replaced by a dash (—).

(5) If the locution carries a restrictive label in the AHD entry, that restrictive label appears here, abbreviated, in capital letters:

IN = INFORMAL
NS = NONSTANDARD

(6) Following the restrictive label, if any, is a two-letter symbol—one capital letter, one small letter—indicating the kind or category of the usage problem.

D – Diction
Da – Association or Style
Dc – Confusion with other words
Dr – Redundancy
Dw – Weakening of absolutes
Dx – Semantic extension

I – Idiom
Im – Miscellaneous
Ip – Preposition choice
Iv – Verb ± particle

G – Grammar
Ga – Adjective/adverb form
Gn – Noun form
Gp – Pronoun form
Gv – Verb form
Gs – Syntax

F – Word Formation
Fb – Back formation
Fd – Derivation
Fs – Functional shift

Sp – Spelling

(7) The vote of the AHD Usage Panel on the questioned usage, reported as a percentage of the Panel approving or rejecting the usage.
A – Accepted or Approved
R – Restricted or Rejected
The figures indicate percentage of Panel members voting in the indicated way.
f – formal
s – in speech
w – in writing
Example: R72fw – "Restricted or rejected by 72 percent of the Panel for use in formal writing."
In a few cases, no percentage (No %) is reported in AHD, and, in a few other cases, only a verbal report of opinion such as "strongly condemned" appears.

(8) Condensed abbreviations of the dictionaries other than AHD and the usage books. In the list below, the abbreviations used throughout the text are supplied:

W2	same	RD	RHD	Kr	Krapp	Co	Copprud
W3	same	RC	RHCD	Le	Leonard	Be	Bernstein
C7	WC7	N1	NWD1	Ev	Evans	Fo	Follett
C8	WC8	N2	NWD2	Ni	Nicholson	Cr	Crisp
		SC	SCD	Br	Bryant	Pe	Perrin

(9) (a) Immediately following the abbreviation identifying the dictionary or usage book appears a one-letter indicator of the treatment of the questioned usage in each work:
N – *Not Treated*
A – *Accepted*
R – *Restricted*
Not Treated means that either the word or locution is not referred to at all, not entered, or, if the word occurs as an entry, the specific problem voted upon by the AHD Panel is not treated.
Accepted means that, in the dictionaries, the usage in question is entered without comment or restriction or it is discussed and approved or accepted; in the usage books, only the latter occurs.
Restricted means that the locution is either assigned a restrictive label or it is discussed and recommended to be completely avoided or limited to use in certain contexts or styles.

(b) For dictionaries only, an asterisk (*) following *A* or *R* indicates that the item is discussed in a note or synonymy instead of or in addition to being characterized by a label.

(10) (a) Abbreviations for restrictive labels: dictionaries and usage books:

ar — archaic
co — colloquial
di — dialectal
il — illiterate
in — informal
lo — loosely
ns — nonstandard

sl — slang
ss — substandard

Brit — Britain
Can — Canada
Scot — Scotland
US — United States

(b) Occasionally, for the usage books only, when a one-word characterization is possible, the "reason" offered for restriction is indicated. The word *avoid* in this use means approximately "although widely used, this is disapproved of by some/many, therefore to be avoided." Other "reasons" are self-explanatory.

The following abbreviations are used:

ambi — ambiguous
casual — casualism
commer — commercial
euphem — euphemism
genteel — genteelism
incorr — incorrect
journal — journalese

legal — legalistic
naut — nautical
redund — redundant
uneduc — uneducated
ungramm — ungrammatical
unnec — unnecessary
vogue — vogue word

(c) For Leonard and Crisp only: pairs of single capital letters separated by a slash indicate evaluations by linguists and by the whole group surveyed in each study. The letters stand for the following:

E — *Established* D — *Disputable* I — *Illiterate* (Leonard only)
N — *Nonstandard* (Crisp only)

Example: E/D means "rated *Established* by the linguists, *Disputable* by the whole group." These abbreviations occur only when the item is ranked R — *Restricted* in these two studies.

about: "not — to do it" Im A40fw

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R ambi
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R in

above (a): as aj, "the — message" Fs A72w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R pedantic	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R commer
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R avoid	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	R avoid

above (b): as n, "read the —" Fs A44

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	R commer
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R avoid	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	R avoid

advise: "to inform or notify" Dx A70

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	R inexact
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	A

agenda (a): with singular verb, "the — is" Gn A86

W2	A	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	A

agenda (b): plural form *agendas* Gn A59

W2	N	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	N

ain't (a): "Ain't I?" NS Gv R99w, 84s

W2	R di/il	RD	R* ns US	Kr	R low co	Co	R uneduc
W3	R* in speech	RC	R* ns US	Le	R D/I	Be	R il
C7	R* in speech	N1	R* co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	R* in speech	N2	R* co	Ni	R il	Cr	R N/N
		SC	R* ns	Br	R ns	Pe	R

ain't (b): "It ain't likely" NS Gv R99ws

W2	R di/il	RD	R* ns	Kr	R low co	Co	R uneduc
W3	R* in s	RC	R* ns	Le	R I/I	Be	R il
C7	R* in s	N1	R* di/ss	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	R* in s	N2	R* di/ss	Ni	R il	Cr	R N/N
		SC	R* il/di	Br	R ns	Pe	R

ain't (c): "Ain't I?" NS Gv A27, 60s

W2	R co	RD	R*	Kr	R kittenish	Co	R feminine
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	R D/I		
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R kittenish	Be	R il
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R ungramm.	Fo	N
		SC	R* ungramm.			Cr	R D/D
				Br	A but rare	Pe	N

alibi (a): as n, "any excuse" Dx A41w

W2	R co	RD	R* US in	Kr	R co	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R US in	Le	N	Be	R casual
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R sl	Cr	N
		SC	R US in	Br	N	Pe	N

alibi (b): as vi, "they never —" Fs A21w

W2	R co	RD	R* US in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

all: in "— that," "not — that difficult" Im A39

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R affected
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R unnec
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

alternative: as n, aj, in ref. to more than two options Dx A58

W2	R lo	RD	A	Kr	R incorr	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	R lo	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	R lo	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	R lo	Br	N	Pe	N

anticipate: "to look forward to with pleasure" Dx A62

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R lo	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

anxious: "eager," "— to see your new car" Dx R72w, A63s

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R avoid w
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

any: "he is the best known of any living playwright" Gs R67w

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R low co	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R avoid	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	R in	Pe	N

anyone: "she is the neatest person of — I know" Gs R64w

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

appreciate: "I — the lateness of the hour" Dx A47

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R genteel	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

as: in neg. comparisons, "not *as* tall as John" Gs A57

W2	A*	RD	A*	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	A	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	N	Br	R	Pe	A

author: as vt, "to — a book" Fs R81w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	R avoid
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R unnec	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

back (a): "a mile — of the lines" Ip R53w

W2	R co US	RD	R*	Kr	R low co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	A	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R co	Cr	N
		SC	R US	Br	R	Pe	N

back (b): with *in*, "in — of the warehouse" Ip R50w

W2	N	RD	R*	Kr	R low co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R D/D	Be	R avoid
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A	Br	R in	Pe	N

bad (a): "he felt *badly*" ("ill") Ga R75w, 69s

W2	R di	RD	R* in	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	R di Brit	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R co careless
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A		
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	R idiom	Fo	A
		SC	R* in	Br	R w	Cr	N
						Pe	R w

bad (b): "he felt *badly*" ("regretful") Ga R61w, A55s

W2	N	RD	R* in	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	R E/D	Be	R co careless
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A		
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	R idiom	Fo	A
		SC	R* in	Br	R w	Cr	R E/D
						Pe	R w

bad (c): "it hurts *bad*" Ga R92w, 75s

W2	R co	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	R ss	RC	N	Le	R D/D	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	R D/D
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	R in

badly: "the garage is — in need of paint" Dx A88w

W2	R co	RD	A*	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R co	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

balance: "remainder" IN Dx A53w

W2	R co	RD	A*	Kr	R lo	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	R* US	Le	N	Be	R dubious
C7	A	N2	R* co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R slipshod	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

balding: "becoming bald" IN Da A55

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	A needed
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R unnec
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US in	Br	N	Pe	N

behalf: interchange "in — of" and "on — of" Ip R58

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	R careless	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

better: "more," "— than a mile" Dx R69w

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R co	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

between (a): "a treaty — five nations" Dx A70

W2	A*	RD	A*	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	R E/D	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	R E/D
		SC	A*	Br	A	Pe	A

between (b): "between you and *I*" Gp R99w, 96s

W2	R•	RD	R•	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	N	RC	R•	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R ns	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R il	Cr	R N/D
		SC	R•	Br	N	Pe	N

bid: as n, "a — to restore harmony" Dx A82w

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R vogue	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

bimonthly: "happening twice a month" NS Dc R84

W2	N	RD	R• lo	Kr	A	Co	R ambig
W3	A	RC	R• lo	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R lo	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R•	Ni	R ambig	Cr	N
		SC	R•	Br	N	Pe	N

bit: "the intellectual —" IN Dx R87

W2	N	RD	R• US sl	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	R• US sl	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US sl	Br	N	Pe	N

blame: with *on*, "— it on your friend" Iv A82w

W2	R co	RD	A•	Kr	R co	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	N	Be	R casual
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	A
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	N

boast: as vt, "the college boasts a fine auditorium" Dx A55w

W2	R ironic	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R journal
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

bug: as n or v in sense "electronic eavesdropping" Dx A69w, 86s

W2	N	RD	R US sl	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	R sl	RC	R US sl	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R sl	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US sl	Br	N	Pe	N

burgeon: "expand," "grow," "a burgeoning population" Dx R51

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

bus (a): as vt, "to bus children to school" IN Fs A48w, 60s

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

bus (b): spelling *busing* vs. *bussing* Sp A50

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	R *ss* only	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

but (a): "no one heard it but *I*" Gp R60

W2	A*	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

but (b): "there is no doubt *but that* he will" Gs R66w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	R in

but (c): "there is no doubt *but what* he will" Gs R95w

W2	R co	RD	R* in	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R* in	Le	R E/D	Be	R casual
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R avoid	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R co	Cr	A
		SC	N	Br	A	Pe	R

buy: as n, "purchase" or "bargain," "a good —" Fs R61w

W2	R co	RD	R US in	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R US in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R ns	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	R in	Pe	N

can (a): vs. *may*, "you can have it" IN Dc R70w

W2	R lo	RD	R•	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R•	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R•	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R•	Br	R	Pe	R

can (b): in questions, "*can* I have it?" IN Dc R77w, R60fs

W2	R lo	RD	R•	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	R E/D	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R•	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R•	Ni	N	Cr	A
		SC	R•	Br	R	Pe	R

can (c): in neg. questions, "why *can't* I?" IN Dc A89s

W2	R lo	RD	R•	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R•	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R•	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	A	Pe	N

can (d): in negatives, "you can't have it" IN Dc A72

W2	R lo	RD	R•	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R•	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R•	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	A	Pe	N

cannot: with *but*, "one – but admire him" Gs A68

W2	A	RD	A•	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A•	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A•	Br	N	Pe	N

careen: "the car careened across the road" Dc A62

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US	Br	N	Pe	N

celebrant: "participant in any celebration" Dx A51

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R ambi	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

center: with *around*, "dispute centers around money" Iv R68w

W2	N	RD	R in	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

certain: compared, "nothing is more — than that" Dw A83

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	R in	Pe	N

claim: "assert," "he claims that it is true" Dx A69w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	R lo	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R vulgar	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	R

cohort: "single companion or associate" IN Dx R69f

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

commentate: as vi or vt, "— a fashion show" Fb vi A09, vt A19

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

compare (a): with unlikes, "— voice *with/to* thunder" Iv *to* only 71

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	R*	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	R

compare (b): with likes, "—Shelley's poetry *with/to* Poe's" Iv *with* only 70

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	R*	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	R

compare (c): "being worthy of comparison" *with/to* IV *with* only 94f

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R*	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	N

compensate: "he compensated by being gentle later" Dx A75

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

complete: compared, "the most — treatment" Dw A67

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	R in	Pe	N

comprise (a): "fifty states — the Union" Dc R61

W2	A	RD	R* in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R* in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R* lo	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

comprise (b): "the Union is comprised of 50 states" Dc R53

W2	N	RD	R* in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R* in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R* lo	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

condition: in sense "illness," "a nervous —" Dx A74

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

consensus: in phrase "— of opinion" Dr R69w

W2	A	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	N	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

consequential: "having importance, significance" Dx R66

W2	A rare	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A rare	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

contact (a): as v, "I'll — you soon" IN Dx R66f

W2	R sl US	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R avoid
C7	A	N1	A*	Ev	R	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	R* in	Br	R co/in	Pe	R

contact (b): as n, "a person as a source of assistance" Dx A61f

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

cope: as vi without *with,* "he can cope" IN Iv R75fw

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

data: as singular, "this — is inconclusive" Gn A50

W2	A*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R I/D	Be	R solecism
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A*	Br	A	Pe	R

debut: as vi or vt, "the singer debuts here" Fs vi R93, vt R97
"the company debuts new models"

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R sl
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

definite: "he is definitely ill" Dx A71

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R sl
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	R overused
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R overused

deprecate: "depreciate" "deprecated is own ability" Dc A52

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

develop: "to contract," "he developed tuberculosis" Dx A67

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R misuse	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

different (a): with *from/than*, "—than that" Im A11

W2	R•	RD	R•	Kr	R avoid	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R	Cr	R D/D
		SC	R•	Br	R	Pe	R

different (b): with *from/than*, "—than what we hoped" Im A17

W2	R•	RD	R•	Kr	R avoid	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	R D/D	Be	R
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	R•	Br	R	Pe	A

different (c): "how — they seem now than yesterday" Im A44

W2	R•	RD	R•	Kr	R avoid	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R•	Br	N	Pe	N

dilemma: when no alternatives are involved Dx R79

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

discomfit: "to make uneasy, disconcert, distress" Dc A80

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

disinterested: "uninterested" NS Dc R93

W2	A rare	RD	R*	Kr	R	Co	R lo
W3	A	RC	R* ns	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R* lo	Br	N	Pe	R avoid

dive: *dove* as preterit, "the airplane dove into the sea" Gv A49w

W2	R co US	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R D/D	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US co	Cr	A
		SC	A	Br	R	Pe	N

done: sense "finished," "all work is – on the project" Dx A53w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R casual
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

dope (*a*): as n, "he peddles –" IN Dx A86w

W2	R sl	RD	A	Kr	R sl	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R sl
C7	A	N1	R sl	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R sl	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R sl	Br	N	Pe	N

dope (b): as v, "the horse was doped" Dx A92w

W2	R racing sl	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R sl	Br	N	Pe	N

double negative: "he would not leave, not even when I did" Gs A71

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	A	Pe	N

doubt (a): "we doubt *whether/if/that* they will come" Im *whether* only 58

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

doubt (b): "I doubt *that* he will come" (expressing genuine doubt) Im R58

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

dropout: from education, "a school dropout" Dx A97ws

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US	Br	N	Pe	N

drunk: used attributively, "drunk driver" Gs R83w

W2	R* di/Scot	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	R*	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	R*	N1	R*	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

due: "he hesitated – to fear" Dc R84w

W2	A*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R D/D	Be	R avoid
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	R*	Br	A	Pe	R

each (a): "they *each have* large followings" Gs R95

W2	N	RD	R*	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	N	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	R

each (b): "Ross and Loeb *each has* a large following" Gs A69

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R

each other (a): (more than two) "the four men regarded *each other* as friends" Dx A55

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	R*	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	A	Pe	A

each other (b): (two only) "husband and wife regard *one another* with suspicion" Dx A54

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	R*	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	A	Pe	A

either: with plu. v, "*are either* of them available?" Gs R92

W2	N	RD	R*	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	A*	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	R	Pe	R avoid

enormity: for "enormousness," "the enormity of Asia" Dc R93

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R* ns	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R lo	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R

enthuse (a): as vi, "he enthused over the gains" IN Fb R76

W2	R co	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R avoid
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R US co	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US in	Br	N	Pe	R avoid

enthuse (b): vt passive, "he was less enthused by the score" Fb R72

W2	N	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R avoid
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R US co	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US in	Br	N	Pe	R avoid

epithet: "abusive utterance," "shouted epithets at him" Dx A53

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R lo	Br	N	Pe	N

equal (a): compared, "more — distribution of money" Dw A71

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

equal (b): in *equally as*, "art is *equally as* valuable *as* science" Dr R63

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	R unnec
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R redund	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

erratum (a): *errata* as sing., "the errata is . . ." Gn R91

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

erratum (b): *erratas* as plural Gn R92

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

escalate: "to — the war is unpardonable" Fb A75

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

escape: without *from*, "he escaped the jail" Iv R74

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

ever: "—so often" for "every so often," "now and then" Dc R74

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R incorr	Co	R
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	R

farther (a): *further* for physical distance Dc R80

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	A	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	R*	Br	A	Pe	A

farther (b): *farther* non-literally, "—from the truth" Dc A33

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	A	Pe	A

farther (c): "we must consider the matter —" Dc R89

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	A	Pe	A

fault: as vt, "to — him is unfair" Fs A52

W2	R di	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R rare	Ev	N	Fo	R vogue
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

few (a): *fewer* vs *less*, "more machines and less people" Gs R77

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	R*	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	R divided	Pe	R

few (b): *fewer* vs *less* "no less than ten applicants" Gs R67

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	R*	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	R divided	Pe	R

few (c): *fewer* vs *less* "with 49 less seats in Parliament" Gs R68

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	R*	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	R divided	Pe	R

finalize: "— plans for the picnic" Fd R90

W2	N	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R US	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	A
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	R

first (a): *first two* vs *two first*, "the two — pages" Gs R51

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	R D/D	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

first (b): *last four* vs *four last*, "the four last pages" Gs R51

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

flammable: vs *inflammable* Dc A61sw

W2	A*	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A*	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

flaunt: for *flout*, NS Dc R91

W2	N	RD	R ns	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R ns	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R

follow: for *follows*, "events are *as follow*" Gs R78

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

foremost: for more than one, "one of the — poets" Dx A76

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

fortuitous: for *fortunate*, "a *fortuitous* outcome" Dc R85

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

gambit: without sense of initial sacrifice Dx A63

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

gauntlet: for *gantlet,* "run the *gauntlet*" Dc A77

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

gift: as vt, "he gifted each of his nephews" IN Fs R94

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	R Brit	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

good (a): as ad, "the watch runs –" IN Ga R100w, 73s

W2	N	RD	R* in	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	R*	RC	R* in	Le	R I/I	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R ss/di/co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R ss/di/co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R* in	Br	R	Pe	R ns

good (b): as ad, "things are going –" IN Fa R86w, 73s

W2	N	RD	R* in	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	R*	RC	R* in	Le	R I/I	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R ss/di/co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R ss/di/co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R* in	Br	R	Pe	R ns

graduate (a): "she *graduated/was graduated* from college" Im equally A77

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	N	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	A	Pe	A

graduate (b): "she graduated college" (without *from*) Iv R93

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R ns	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R* ns	Br	R ns	Pe	R ns

groom: for *bridegroom* Dx A90ws
(except “most formal”)

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R co	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

hang (a): preterit, “the sheriff *hung* the prisoner” Gv A31

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R*	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	R	Pe	R

hang (b): passive, “three men *were hung* for theft” Gv A34

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R*	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	R	Pe	R

head: vs *head up*, “he *heads up* the committee” Iv R85

W2	R sl	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R journal
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

headquarter: as vi or vt, “he headquarters in Paris” IN Fb vi R92, vt R90
“he has been headquartered in Paris”

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

hectic: sense “feverish activity or haste” Dx A92

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	R sl	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R vogue	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

help: in phrase “cannot help but” Gs A42f

W2	R co	RD	A*	Kr	R crude	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	R D/D	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R ungramm
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R co	Cr	R E/D
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	R avoid

hopefully: "—, we shall complete work in June" Dx A44

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	N	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R solecism
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	R unEnglish
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	R vogue

host: as v, "Chicago hosted the meeting" IN Fs R82

W2	R local US	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

human: as n, "air not fit for humans to breathe" Gs R72

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	R co	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

identify (a): "he identified himself with the hero" Dx A93

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	R vogue
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

identify (b): "he identified with the hero" Im A57

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	R vogue
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

idle: as vt, "the strike has idled the crews" Dx A62

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US in	Br	N	Pe	N

ilk: sense "type," "men of that ilk" Dx A65

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

important: vs *importantly,* "more important, he has resigned" Ga A50

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

individual (a): "person," "an odd —" Dx A55

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R overused	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

individual (b): "person," "a disagreeable —" Dx A47

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R overused	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

individual (c): "person," "two individuals sought to enter" Dx A38

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R overused	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

infer: sense "imply" Dc R92

W2	R lo	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	N	RC	R* in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R lo	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R lo	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	R

insignia (a): as sing., "the *insignia* is red" Gn A73

W2	N	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

insignia (b): *insignias* as plu., "the insignias are . . ." Gn A56

W2	N	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

internecine: sense "internal struggle, not necessarily fatal" Dx A91

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	R broadly	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

interpretative: vs *interpretive*, "an interpretive dance" Dc A70

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

intrigue: as vt, "arouse interest" Dx A52

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R literary sl	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

kind (a): "*these kind* of books have . . ." Gs R90fw

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A*	RC	N	Le	R D/I	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R avoid	Cr	R D/D
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	R

kind (b): "*that kind* of buildings seem . . ." Gs R75fw

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	A	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	N

kind (c): "what *kind* of buildings *are* these?" Gs A76

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

lack: as vi, with *for*, "will not – for support" Iv A42

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

latter: referring to one of more than two Dx R69

W2	N	RD	R*	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

leave (a): "– him alone and he will produce" Dc A63w

W2	R il/di	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	R ss	RC	N	Le	R D/D	Be	R
C7	N	N1	R sl	Ev	A	Cr	N
C8	N	N2	R di or sl	Ni	N	Fo	A
		SC	R* sl or il	Br	N	Pe	A

leave (b): "left alone, he will produce" Dc A81w

W2	R il/di	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	R ss	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R sl	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R di or sl	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R* sl or il	Br	N	Pe	N

like (a): as co, with elliptical or shortened clauses NS Gs A76f
"the dress looked – new"

W2	R* co	RD	R* ns	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

like (b): as co, with full clauses NS Gs R "more than 75%"
"he acted – he enjoyed it"

W2	R* il	RD	R* ns	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R* ns	Le	R D/D	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	R* in/il	Br	R	Pe	R avoid

likely: as ad, without qualifier, "he will (very) likely arrive tomorrow" Im R "more than 70%"

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	A	RC	N	Le	R D/D	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	R E/D
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

loan: as v, "to – money to a friend" Dc R70fw

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R avoid	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	A	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

materialize: "happen" or "occur" Dx A33

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

me: in "it is me" Gp R78fw, A60s

W2	R* co/di	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A*	RC	N	Le	R E/D	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	R co	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	N

medium (a): *media* as sing., "the media is . . ." Gn R90w, 88s

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

medium (b): *medias* as plu., "the medias are . . ." Gn "condemned even more severly"

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

mighty: as intensifier, "he is – tall" IN Dx R89w, A56s

W2	R co	RD	R in	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	R in	Pe	R

most (a): for *almost*, "– everyone agrees" IN Dc R92w, 53s

W2	R co/in	RD	R in	Kr	R di	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	R D/D	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	R D/D
		SC	R in	Br	R	Pe	R

most (b): for *very*, "she is – gracious" Dx A86w, 96s

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

mutual (a): for more than two, "our – friend" Dc A86

W2	A	RD	A*	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

mutual (b): "a – aid pact" Dc A83

W2	A	RD	A*	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

myself (a): for *me* in object, "he asked John and myself" Gp R95

W2	N	RD	R* ns	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R* ns	Le	R E/D	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	R D/D
		SC	R in	Br	A	Pe	R avoid

myself (b): for *I* in subject, "John and myself will go" Gp "strongly condemned"

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	A	RC	N	Le	R D/D	Be	R
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	A	Pe	R

nauseous: for *nauseated* Dc R88

W2	R obsolete	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	R

negotiate: "we negotiated a sharp curve" Dx A46w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

nicely: "this will serve –" Dx A68w

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

none: with plu. v, "— of us *are* going" Gs A68

W2	A*	RD	A*	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	R E/D	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	A*	Br	A	Pe	A

normalcy: for *normality* Fd R59w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

noun: use of noun attributes, "health reasons," A29,
"disaster proportions," A57, "beatnik-type beards," A63, Gs
"sex-education course," A87

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R

oblivious (a): "not conscious or mindful of" Dx A70

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	R incorr	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R avoid
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R misuse	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

oblivious (b): with *to* vs *of*, "oblivious to . . ." Ip A52

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

O.K. (a): as n, "his OK is needed" IN Fs A57w

W2	R co	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R in/co	Fo	R sl
C8	A	N2	R US co	Ni	R business	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	R in

O.K. (b): as v, "to OK an arrangement" IN Fs A42w

W2	R co	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R US co	Ev	R in/co	Fo	R sl
C8	A	N2	R US co	Ni	R business	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	R in

O.K. (c) : as pred aj, "all is not OK" IN Fs A23w

W2	R co	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R US co	Ev	R in/co	Fo	R sl
C8	A	N2	R US co	Ni	R business	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	R in

O.K. (d) : as ad, "it works OK" IN Fs A20w

W2	N	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R US co	Ev	R in/co	Fo	R sl
C8	A	N2	R US co	Ni	R business	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	R in

one (a) : "one in every ten men *were* found deficient" Gs R92

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	R N/N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	N

one (b) : "one of those men who *is* always complaining" Gs R58

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A*	Br	A	Pe	R

only (a) : "Precise" placement of *only* Gs "The Usage Panel specifies . . ."

W2	N	RD	A*	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	R E/D	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	N	Br	R	Pe	A

only (b) : as co, "I would have come, — the car broke down" Fs R85

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

outside: with *of*, "— *of* the house," "— *of* my authority" Ip R84

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R redund
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US co	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	R co	Pe	N

over: "more than," "— ten dollars" Dx A63w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R co	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

overly: as ad, "— cautious" Fd A60w

W2	R di US, Scot	RD	A	Kr	R co/di	Co	N
		RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
W3	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C7	A	N2	A	Ni	R US, Scot	Cr	N
C8	A	SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

participle (a): dangling—, in "stock" expressions Gs A "substantial majority"
"strictly speaking, the work is not . . . "

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R co/lo	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

participle (b): in absolute constructions, Gs A (No %)
"everything considered, the work is . . ."

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	A	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

participle (c): vs gerund, "he objected to *me going*" Gs R (No %)
"gerund is form recommended by Panel"

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	N	RC	R*	Le	R D/D	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	R E/D
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R avoid

personality: "celebrity" or "notable," "a TV —" Dx A43fw

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

practically (a): "almost," "— extinct" Dx A51

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N co	Ev	R lo	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

practically (b): "almost," "he had — finished lunch" Dx A46

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

predicate: "base upon," "success is predicated upon hard work" Dx A62

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R US	Br	N	Pe	N

premiere: as v, "to — the play" Fs R86

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

presently (a): "in a short time" Dx A73

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

presently (b): "at this time" Dx A49

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R* in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

proportion: "meal of gargantuan proportions" Dx A65

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R journal
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

prove: *proved* vs *proven* as pp., "it has proven easy" Gv A27

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R legal	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R D/E	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	A

provided: as co, vs *providing*, "providing it happens" Im R64w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R E/D	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	R

quick: as ad, "by moving —, they hoped to succeed" Ga R90w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R E/D	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R idiom	Cr	R D/D
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

quite (a): "somewhat," "— warm for spring" Dx A81w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	R co	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R casual
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

quite (b): "it will be — all right" Dx A86

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

quite (c): "the two are — similar" Dx A65

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

quite (d): "— a few failed to report" Dx A61w

W2	R co	RD	N	Kr	R di/co	Co	R
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R casual
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	R in	Pe	N

quiz (a): as vt, "they quizzed the suspect" Dx A56w

W2	R US	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Cr	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R lo US	Fo	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

quiz (b): as n, "the senate — opens tomorrow" Dx A43w

W2	R US	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R lo US	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

quote: as n, for "quotation" IN Fs R85w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R casual
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	R crude
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	R avoid	Cr	N
		SC	R lo	Br	N	Pe	N

raise (a): "rear" or "bring up" Dc A82w

W2	A*	RD	A	Kr	R co/di	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R D/D	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US	Cr	A
		SC	R US	Br	A	Pe	A

raise (b): as vi, "windows — easily" Dc A48

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R incorr	Co	R
W3	N	RC	N	Le	R I/I	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	R D/D
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

raise (c): as n, "increase in salary" Dc A91w

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R co	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US co	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	N

rambunctious: use of in formal writing Da A84fw

W2	R US sl	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US in	Br	N	Pe	N

rarely: with *ever*, "he — ever watches TV" Dr R87w, R62s

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	R co	Pe	N

rate (a): as vt, "he rates special treatment" IN Dx R74w

W2	R naut sl	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

rate (b): as vi, "have status," "he really rates" IN Dx R65w

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

rattle: as vt, "to unnerve," "he was rattled by the noise" IN Dx A86w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	R sl	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

regard: *regards* vs *respects*, "in some regards . . ." Dc R84

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

rendition: "performance," "a stirring —" Dx A69

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

renege: "he reneged on his commitment" Dx A74w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US co	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

replica: "reproduction in miniature" Dx A60

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	R lo	Co	R
W3	N	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

responsible: with nonpersonal subj, "defective construction was — for the crash" Dx A70

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R lo	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

reverend (a): as title without *the*, "Rev. James Jones" Im R59

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	R*	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	R*	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	R*	N2	R*	Ni	R il	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

reverend (b): use without *the* and with last name only, "Rev. Smith" Im R63

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	R low co	Co	N
W3	R*	RC	R*	Le	R I/D	Be	R
C7	R*	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	R*	N2	R*	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

rile: "vex" or "anger," "her style riled him" Da A69fw

W2	R co US	RD	R US	Kr	R co/di	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R US	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co/di	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co/di	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in/di	Br	N	Pe	N

ring: preterit *rung*, "the bell rung repeatedly" NS Gv R85s

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R di	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	R ar/di	Br	A	Pe	N

saving: "a savings of ten dollars" Gn R89w

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R il
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

scan: "to look over quickly," "— the newspaper" Dx A85w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US co	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

seem: in construction "can't — to" Im A51w

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	R D/D	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R US	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	A
		SC	N	Br	R in	Pe	A

senior citizen: "old person" Da A47

C7	N	RD	R US	Kr	N	Co	R euphem
W3	N	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R euphem
W2	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	R genteel
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US,Can	Br	N	Pe	N

shakedown (a): as n, "extortion," "the — was successful;
he got the money" IN Dx A80

W2	R sl	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R sl	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R sl	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R US sl	Br	N	Pe	N

shakedown (b): as v, "to extort money from,"
"the police shake down bartenders" IN Dx A67

W2	R sl	RD	R sl	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R sl	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R sl	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R sl	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R sl	Br	N	Pe	N

shall: vs *will*, "we will be in Ohio next week" Gv A62w

W2	A*	RD	A*	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	R*	Br	A	Pe	A

shambles: "the apartment is a —" Dx A85w

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

should (a): vs *would*, in sentences expressing a simple
condition, "if I could, I would" Gv A80

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	A

should (b) : vs *would* with 1st person subj, "I would like to" Gv A77

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R*	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	A*	Br	N	Pe	A

sick (a) : —*at* vs — *to*, "—to the stomach" Ip "slight pref. for *at*"

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	A

sick (b) : "morbid," "— humor" Dx A81

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

simultaneous: as ad, "the referendem was conducted —
with the election" Ga R100

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

so (a) : as conj in clause of purpose without *that*,
"he stayed so he could watch the movie" Im A44w

W2	N	RD	R*	Kr	R co	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R*	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R*	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	R	Pe	R

so (b) : to introduce clause of result or consequence,
"it rained, so we delayed our departure" Im A83w

W2	R co	RD	R*	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	R	Pe	A

some: as ad, "somewhat," "her looks have improved some" IN Dc R87

W2	R co	RD	R in	Kr	R co/di	Co	R di
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	R D/D	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	A
		SC	R in/di	Br	N	Pe	R in

someplace: for *somewhere,* "a target someplace between Paris and Lyons" IN Dc R83w

W2	R co	RD	R* in	Kr	R co/di	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R* in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	R co	Pe	R

sometime: for *occasional,* "– star and – problem child" NS Dx A30

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R ar
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

someway: for *somehow,* "–we must find time" IN Dc R83

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	R rare	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

sound: as vt with *out,* "– out the chairman" Dx A87w

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	A unnec	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

spark: "cause," "– a revolt" Dx A71

W2	N	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

spell: in *spell out,* "state explicitly," "– out provisions of the new code" Dx A79w

W2	N	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

spiral: as v, "climb upward," "prices are spiraling" Dx A78

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

split infinitive (a): "to gradually, easily, and economically relieve the burden" Gs R77

W2	R*	RD	A*	Kr	R avoid	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	R avoid
C7	N	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	R	Pe	R

split infinitive (b): "to really help" Gs A41

W2	R*	RD	A*	Kr	R avoid	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	R avoid
C7	N	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	R	Pe	R avoid

split infinitive (c): "to better understand" Gs A50

W2	R*	RD	A*	Kr	R avoid	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	R avoid
C7	N	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	R	Pe	R avoid

split infinitive (d): "to more than double" Gs A60

W2	R*	RD	A*	Kr	R avoid	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	A	Be	R avoid
C7	N	N1	A*	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	A*	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	N	Br	R	Pe	R avoid

spoof (a): as n, "parody," "a — of a drama" Dx A82w

W2	R sl	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R sl	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

spoof (b): as v, "the sketch spoofs serious drama" Dx A66

W2	R sl	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R sl	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

stall (a): as vi, "delay," "he tried to —" Dx A75w

W2	R sl	RD	R	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R sl	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

stall (b): with *off*, "tried to – off her creditors" Iv A62w

W2	R co	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

stomp: for *stamp*, "she stomped her foot" Dc R76w

W2	R di	RD	R in	Kr	R di	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R di	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R di	Br	R	Pe	N

straddle (a): as vt, "– the issue" Dx A87

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

straddle (b): as vi, "he straddles on all issues" Dx A57

W2	R co	RD	R in	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

suffer: –*from* vs –*with*, "he suffered with ague" Iv R94

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

sustain: "– a broken leg," "– losses" Dx A56

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R crude	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R journal
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R avoid	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

tend: –*to* for *attend to*, "I will – to the matter" IN Dc R80fw

W2	R obs ex di	RD	A	Kr	R low co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R di	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	R co	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

that: vs *which* in restrictive clauses, "a law *which* is unjust cannot be enforced" Gs A54

W2	A*	RD	A*	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A*	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	R*	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	R*	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	A

this: vs *that* as demonstrative, "seventy witnesses testified; *this* is a large number" Dc A72

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	A	Pe	A

though: at end of clause, "he doesn't approve, though" Gs R61fw

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

through: as aj, "finished," "are you through yet?" Dx A75w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	R co	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US co	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

thusly: as ad for *thus,* "do it thusly" Fd R97

W2	R co	RD	R* in	Kr	R	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R in	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

too: "very" with a negative, "passage of the bill is *not too* likely" Im R80w

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R in	Br	N	Pe	N

transpire: "happen," "come to pass" Dx R62

W2	R*	RD	A	Kr	R	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	R lo	Ev	R avoid	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	R lo	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	A

trek: "travel," "the daily – to Chicago" Dx A78w

W2	R lo	RD	A	Kr	R sl	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R lo	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R lo	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

tribute: "the verdict is a – to their fairness' Dx A69

W2	R*	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

trigger: as vt, "activate," "what triggered the revolt?" Dx A77

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R vogue
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R vogue
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	R vogue
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

truculent: "pugnacious," "surly," "defiant" Dx A86

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

try (a): with *and*, "to *try and* force compliance" Im R79w

W2	R co	RD	N	Kr	R co	Co	A
W3	A	RC	N	Le	R E/D	Be	R avoid
C7	N	N1	R* co	Ev	A	Fo	A
C8	N	N2	R co	Ni	R co	Cr	A
		SC	R*	Br	R in	Pe	R

try (b): as n, "it was a good try" Fs A59w

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R co	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

tycoon: "powerful businessman" IN Dx A90w

W2	R US co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R in	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R US co	Cr	N
		SC	R US in	Br	N	Pe	N

type (a): *—of* vs —, "that — leather is no good" Ip R94

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	N	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	R• co	Ev	R	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	R• co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	R• in	Br	R	Pe	R avoid

type (b): for *kind,* "not the — of person I like" Dx A67

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A•	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

unexceptional: for *unexceptionable,* "above reproach" Dc R87

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	R lo	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R lo	Br	N	Pe	N

unique: compared, "rather unique book" Dw R94

W2	N	RD	N	Kr	R lo	Co	A
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	A•	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	A•	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R lo	Br	R in	Pe	R

upcoming: "approaching," "the — election" Dx R71w

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R avoid
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N1	A	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

upward: (or—s) "a bit less than," "almost," "upward of ten" = "less than ten" Im R82

W2	R di	RD	N	Kr	R	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

various: as pl. coll. pn, "he spoke to various of the members" Fs R91

W2	R US	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	N	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

very: modifying participles, "very worried" A86w; "very disliked" R87; "very delayed" R85; very inconvenienced" R80 Gs

W2	R•	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	N	Le	R D/D	Be	A
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	A•	Br	A	Pe	A

viewpoint: "point of view" Da A76f

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	R avoid	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	R E/D	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	R	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A•	Br	N	Pe	A

were: vs *was* in conditionals, "I wish it *was*" A26; "suppose it *was* true" A22; "if it *was* more favorable" A19; "as though all *was* settled" A31 Gv

W2	R•	RC	N	Kr	A	Co	R
W3	N	RD	N	Le	A	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	R

whence: in *from* —, "the source from — it comes" Dr R64

W2	R•	RD	R•	Kr	R incorr	Co	R
W3	A	RC	R•	Le	R E/D	Be	R
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

which: as rel. pn. with clause antecedent, "she ignored him, — proved unwise" Gs A35

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	N	Le	A	Be	R
C7	A•	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A•	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	A
		SC	A•	Br	N	Pe	A

while (a) : as co, "— we hate force, we recognize the need for law and order" Dx A68w

W2	R•	RD	A	Kr	R crude	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	A
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	N
		SC	A•	Br	A	Pe	R

while (b) : as co, "the colonists imported their weapons, — the Indians made their own" Dx A59w

W2	R•	RD	A	Kr	R crude	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	N
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R journal	Cr	N
		SC	A•	Br	N	Pe	R

while (c) : as co, "John is English, his wife is French, — his good friend is German" Dx A37

W2	R•	RD	A	Kr	R crude	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R journal
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	R journal	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R journal	Cr	N
		SC	A•	Br	N	Pe	R

who (a) : vs *whom*, "*who* did you meet?" Gp R87fw, A66s

W2	R• co	RD	N	Kr	R co	Co	A
W3	A•	RC	N	Le	R E/D	Be	R
C7	A•	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A•	N2	R• co	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A•	Br	R	Pe	R

who (b) : "he wants to know *who* he should speak to" Gp R92w, A59s

W2	R•	RD	N	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A•	RC	N	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A•	N1	R co	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	A•	N2	R• co	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A•	Br	R	Pe	R

who (c) : "he interviewed a girl *whom* he thinks will be excellent" Gp R89w, R83s

W2	R•	RD	N	Kr	R incorr	Co	A
W3	R•	RC	N	Le	R I/I	Be	R
C7	R•	N1	N	Ev	A	Fo	R
C8	R•	N2	N	Ni	R	Cr	R D/D
		SC	N	Br	R	Pe	R

whose: as possessive for inanimates, "the play, — style is informal . . ." Gp A74

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	A	Be	N
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	R E/D
		SC	A	Br	A	Pe	A

why: in expression "the reason why" Dr R65w

W2	A	RD	N	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	A	Be	N
C7	N	N1	A	Ev	A	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	A
		SC	A•	Br	R	Pe	N

win: as n, "a victory," "an impressive — in the primary" Fs R67fw

W2	R co	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	N
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R casual
C7	A	N1	R co	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	R co	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	A	Br	N	Pe	N

wise: "taxwise, it is an attractive arrangement" Fd R84

W2	A*	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A*	Ev	N	Fo	R
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	A	Cr	R E/D
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	R avoid

wish: for *want* with n. object, "do you wish coffee?" Dc A39

W2	R*	RD	R*	Kr	R di	Co	N
W3	N	RC	R*	Le	N	Be	N
C7	N	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	N	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

Xmas: spelling for *Christmas* IN Sp R88

W2	A	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	R
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	A	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	A	Ni	R	Cr	N
		SC	R*	Br	N	Pe	R

zoom (a): lateral movement, "the car zoomed around the corner" Dx A64

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	N	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	N	Be	R
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	N	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

zoom (b): downward movement, "the eagle zoomed down on its prey" Dx A31

W2	N	RD	A	Kr	A	Co	A
W3	A	RC	A	Le	A	Be	R incorr
C7	A	N1	N	Ev	R incorr	Fo	N
C8	A	N2	N	Ni	N	Cr	N
		SC	N	Br	N	Pe	N

APPENDIX 2

AHD USAGE PANEL MEMBERS

Note: These are the names listed in both the 1969 and the 1971 editions of AHD. A few individuals have been replaced in the 1973 edition listing.

J. Donald Adams
Cleveland Amory
Isaac Asimov
John Bainbridge
Russell Baker
Sheridan Baker
Lincoln Barnett
Jacques Barzun
Stewart Beach
Charles F. Berlitz
Theodore M. Bernstein
Morris Bishop
Alton Blakeslee
Morton W. Bloomfield
Ben Zion Bokser
Arna Bontemps
Charles P. Boren
Catherine Drinker Bowen
Joseph A. Brandt
Herbert Brucker
Erwin D. Canham
Carl Carmer
Gerald Carson
Hodding Carter
Claudia Cassidy
Bruce Catton
John Ciardi
Arthur A. Cohen
Marc Connelly
Alistair Cooke
Roy H. Copperud
George A. Cornish
Robert Coughlan
Malcolm Cowley
Basil Davenport
Donald Davidson
Marshall B. Davidson
Rene Dubos
Luther Evans
John Fischer
George Gamow
Lewis Gannett
Brendan Gill
Eric F. Goldman
Sydney Harris
Mark O. Hatfield
Gilbert Highet
Paul Horgan
Langston Hughes
Peter Hurd
John K. Hutchens
William F. Johnston
Lewis Webster Jones
Walter Kerr
John Kieran
James Kraft
Louis Kronenberger
Milton I. Levine, M.D.
Walter Lippman
Russell Lynes
Eugene McCarthy
Dwight Macdonald
David McCord
Margaret Mead
Rhoda Metreaux
William J. Miller
Marianne Moore
Lewis Mumford
John Courtney Murray, S.J.
Maurine Neuberger
James Newman
Margaret Nicholson
David Ogilvy
Mario Pei
James A. Pike
Katherine Anne Porter
Orville Prescott
Charles D. Rice
Berton Roueché
Richard Rovere
Vermont Royster
Winthrop Sergeant
Robert Saudek
Glenn T. Seaborg
Harlow Shapley
John K. Sherman
Walter W. (Red) Smith
Theodore Sorensen
Wallace Stegner
George R. Stewart
Allen Tate
Henry F. Thoma
Virgil Thomson
Barbara W. Tuchman
Stewart Udall
Irita Van Doren
Mark Van Doren
William Vaughan
Calvert Watkins
Richard Watts, Jr.
Hobart G. Weekes
Anthony West
Rogers Whitaker
Oscar Williams
William Zinsser

APPENDIX 3

ENTRIES CONTAINING USAGE NOTES IN AHD

• Indicates that the note contains a Usage Panel vote
# Indicates that the note appears in the 1973 edition, not in the 1971

a
ability
able
• about
• above
absolutely
acceptation
accompany
acquiesce
act
adage
addict
admit
admittance
adopt
advance
• advise
affect
affinity
• agenda
ago
• ain't
• alibi
• all
all-round
allusion
alongside
already
also
• alternative
although
altogether
alumnus
amenable
analogous
and
Anno Domini
another
• anticipate
antidote
• anxious
• any
• anyone
anyway
• appreciate
apt
Aryan
• as
assure
• author
avenge
averse
awhile

• back
• bad
• badly
• balance
• balding
baleful
barbarism
bear
because
• behalf
besides
• better
• between
• bid
• bimonthly
• bit
bite
blacken
• blame
blatant
blink
blond
• boast
both
bracket
breadth
brief
bring
broad
broken
• bug
bureaucrat
• burgeon
• bus
• but
• buy

callus
• can
• cannot
• careen
• celebrant
• center
ceremonial
• certain
chair
childish
• claim
classic
cleanse
clench
climb
• cohort
collective noun
• collide #
come
comma
• commentate
company
• compare
• compensate
• complete
• comprise
concur
• condition
• consensus
• consequential
consider
considerable
consistency
• contact
contemporary
content
continuance
contrast
convince
• cope
• cosmetic #
council
couple
criterion
• crunch #
czar
dash

dare
dastardly
• data
deadly
• debut
defective
• definite
delusion
demand
depend
• deprecate
• develop
die
• different
• dilemma
direct
• discomfit
disgusted
• disinterested
distinctive
• dive

• done
don't
• dope
• double negative
• doubt
doubtless
dozen
drag
• dropout
• drunk
• due

• each
• each other
easy
• either
elder
• enormity
• enthuse
• epithet
• equal
• erratum
• escalate
• escape
etc.
• ever
everyone
every place
except
exceptionable

• farther
• fault
feel
• few
• finalize
• first
• flammable
• flaunt
• follow
foot
forbid
forcible
• foremost
former
• fortuitous
-ful
fulsome

• gambit
• gauntlet
• gift
• good
government
• graduate
• groom
group

• hang
hardly
• head
• headquarter
• hectic
• help
here
historic
home
• hopefully
• host
however
• human

I
• identify
• idle
• ilk
• important
in
• individual
• infer
inside
• insignia
intend
• internecine
• interpretative
• intrigue
irregardless
Israel
its

(No *J* entries)

kilt
• kind
know
kudos

• lack
• latter
lay
learn
• leave
let
• like prep.
like v.
• likely
likewise
• loan
loud
majority
• materialize
may
• me
mean
means
meantime
• medium
• mighty
migrate
minimize
moneys
month
Moslem
• most
mostly
movable
• mutual
• myself

• nauseous
near
née
need
• negative
• negotiate
neither
next
• nicely
• noisome #
nominal
non-
• none
no one
nor
• normalcy

nothing
• noun
now
number

O, oh
object
oblige
• oblivious
occasion
occur
oculist
odd
of
off
• O.K.
on
• one
• only
opportunity
opposite
or
other
ought
out
• outside
• over
overlay
• overly

pair
parallel
• participle
partly
pass
people
per cent
perfect
perfectly
permit
person
• personality
personnel
place
plan
plead
plural
plus

politics
possessed
possessive
• practically
precedence
precedent
precipitate
• predicate
prefer
• premiere
preparatory
preposition
prerequisite
• presently
prevent
principal
• proportion
protagonist
• prove
• provided

• quick
• quite
• quiz
quotation mark
• quote

• raise
• rambunctious
rare
• rarely
• rate
rather
• rattle
re
• regard
• rendition
• renege
repel
replete
• replica
request
• responsible
restive
• reverend
• rile
• ring

sacrilegious
sacrosanct
Sahara
said
same
• saving
say
• scan
scarcely
Scotsman
seasonable
see
• seem
semicolon
senior
• senior citizen
sensitivity
series
service
set
• shakedown
• shall
• shambles
• should
• sick
sierra
similar
• simultaneous
sink
slow
smell
• so
so-called
soluble
• some
somebody
someday
someone
• someplace
• sometime
• someway
soon
sort
sound v.i.
• sound v.t.
• spark
special
• spell
• spiral
• split infinitive
• spoof
• stall
staunch
• stomp
• straddle
stratum
subsequent
• suffer
superior
• sustain

tear
• tend
than
• that
there
• this
thou
• though
• through
• thusly
till
to
together
• too
tortuous
• transpire
• trek
• tribute
• trigger
trio
• truculent
• try
• tycoon
• type

un-
unaware
underestimate
• unexceptional
• unique
unless
• upcoming
• upward
usage
use

• various
verbal
• very
• viewpoint

wait
wake
want
way
we
well
• were
what
when
• whence
where
• which
• while
whiskey
• who
• whose
• why
will
• win
• -wise
• wish
with
wrong

• Xmas

yet
yourself

• zoom

APPENDIX 4

AHD USAGE NOTES IN WHICH VOTES ARE RECORDED ON MORE THAN ONE USAGE MATTER OR SAMPLE

(Number following entry word indicates the number of votes reported in the usage note in that entry.)

These 65 entries contain 157 votes.

above	2
agenda	2
ain't	3
alibi	2
back	2
bad	3
between	2
bus	2
but	3
can	4
compare	3
comprise	2
contact	2
different	3
dope	2
doubt	2
each	2
each other	2
enthuse	2
equal	2
erratum	2
farther	3
few	3
first	2
good	2
graduate	2
hang	2
identify	2
individual	3
insignia	2
kind	3
leave	2
like	2
medium	2
most	2
mutual	2
myself	2
noun	4
oblivious	2
O.K.	4
one	2
only	2
participle	3
practically	2
presently	2
quite	4
quiz	2
raise	3
rate	2
reverend	2
shakedown	2
should	2
sick	2
so	2
split infinitive	4
spoof	2
stall	2
straddle	2
try	2
type	2
very	4
were	4
while	3
who	3
zoom	2

APPENDIX 5

AHD USAGE NOTES WITH PANEL JUDGMENTS CLASSIFIED BY KIND OF PROBLEM

Note: The 226 usage notes containing Usage Panel votes involve 247 different problems when the problems are classified as to kind; twenty of the notes involve two or more problems each. When an entry contains two or more problems in the same category, a figure in parentheses follows the entry word in this list. When an entry contains two or more problems of *different* categories, the entry word appears more than once in this list.

Diction (137)

A. Semantic Development, Extension of Meaning (Dx) (90)

advise
alibi
alternative
anticipate
anxious
appreciate
badly
balance
better
between
bid
bit
boast
bug
burgeon
celebrant
claim
cohort
compensate
condition
consequential
contact (2)
definite
develop
dilemma
done
dope
dropout
each other (2)
epithet
foremost
gambit
groom
hectic
hopefully
identify
idle
ilk
individual
internecine
intrigue
latter
materialize
mighty
most
negotiate
nicely
oblivious
over
personality
practically
predicate
presently (2)
proportion
quite
quiz
rate (2)
rattle
rendition
renege
replica
responsible
scan
shakedown
shambles
sick
sometime
sound
spark
spell
spiral
spoof
stall
straddle
sustain
through
transpire
trek
tribute
trigger
truculent
tycoon
type
upcoming
while
zoom

B. Confusion With Other Words (Dc) (33)

bimonthly
can
careen
comprise
deprecate
discomfit
disinterested
due
enormity
ever
farther
flammable
flaunt
fortuitous
gauntlet
infer
interpretative
leave
loan
most
mutual
nauseous
raise (2)
regard
some
someplace
someway
stomp
tend
this
unexceptional
wish

C. Weakening of Absolutes (Dw) (4)

certain
complete
equal
unique

D. Association or Style (Da) (5)

balding
rambunctious
rile
senior citizen
viewpoint

E. Redundancy (Dr) (5)

consensus
equally
rarely
whence
why

Grammar (52)

A. Syntax (Gs) (27)

any
anyone
as
but (2)
cannot
double negative
drunk
each
either
few
first
follow
help
kind
like
none
noun
one
only
participle (2)
split infinitive
that
though
very
which

B. Morphology (25)

1. Noun (Gn) (6)

agenda
data
erratum
insignia
medium
saving

2. Pronoun (Gp) (6)

between
but
me
myself
who
whose

3. Adjective/Adverb (Ga) (5)

bad
good
important
quick
simultaneous

4. Verb (Gv) (8)

ain't
dive
hang
prove
ring
shall
should
were

Idiom (30)

A. Preposition (Ip) (6)

back
behalf
oblivious
outside
sick
type

B. Verb plus Particle (Iv) (10)

blame
center
compare
cope
escape
graduate
head
lack
stall
suffer

C. Miscellaneous (Im) (14)

about
all
different
doubt
graduate
identify
likely
provided
reverend
seem
so
too
try
upward

Word Formation (26)

A. Functional Shift (Fs) (17)

above
alibi
author
bus
buy
debut
fault
gift
host
human
O.K.
only
premiere
quote
try
various
win

B. Derivation (Fd) (5)

finalize
normalcy
overly
thusly
-wise

C. Back Formation (Fb) (4)

commentate
enthuse
escalate
headquarter

Spelling (2)

bus
Xmas

Totals	
Diction	137
Grammar	52
Idiom	30
Word Formation	26
Spelling	2
	247

APPENDIX 6

AHD USAGE NOTES WITH PANEL JUDGMENTS INVOLVING TWO OR MORE KINDS OF PROBLEMS OR TWO OR MORE PROBLEMS OF THE SAME KIND

Note: Symbols following entry words refer to kind of problem. See Appendix 5 for interpretation of symbols.

alibi	Dx	Fs	
between	Dx	Gp	
bus	Fs	S	
but	Gp	Gs	Gs
contact	Dx	Dx	
each other	Dx	Dx	
equal	Dw	Im	
graduate	Im	Iv	
identify	Dx	Im	
most	Dc	Dx	
oblivious	Dx	Ip	
only	Gs	Fs	
participle	Gs	Gs	
presently	Dx	Dx	
raise	Dc	Dc	
rate	Dx	Dx	
sick	Ip	Dx	
stall	Dx	Iv	
try	Im	Fs	
type	Ip	Dx	

APPENDIX 7

RANKING BY DECILE OF AHD USAGE PANEL APPROVAL VOTES OF ALL USAGES ON WHICH A PANEL VOTE IS REPORTED: EACH USAGE AND VOTE CLASSIFIED AS TO KIND OF PROBLEM

The following abbreviations and symbols are used:

1. /a/, /b/, /c/, etc., following entry words refer to subitems under the indicated entry word. See Master List, Appendix 1, p. 147.
2. /f/ = formal   /vi/ = intransitive verb
   /s/ = in speech   /vt/ = transitive verb
   /w/ = in writing
3. Abbreviations indicating Category of Problem follow each item (Gv, Dx, Ip, etc.). For an explanation of these abbreviations, see Appendix 5, p. 193.
4. hTe numbers /1/, /2/, /3/, and /4/ following the entry word *noun* refer to specific noun phrases. See Master List, Appendix 1, p. 169, under *noun*.

Note: The entries *only* (a) and *participle* (a, b, and c) are not included in this listing. No percentage of approval or disapproval is given in AHD.

Decile 1 (0-9%)

Number of Approval Votes = 34

ain't/a/w	Gv	enormity	Dc	myself/a	Gp
ain't/b/s/w	Gv	erratum/a	Gn	myself/b	Gp
bad/c/w	Ga	erratum/b	Gn	one/a	Gs
between/b/s/w	Gp	flaunt	Dc	simultaneous	Ga
but/c	Gs	gift	Fs	suffer	Iv
commentate/vt	Fb	good/a/w	Ga	thusly	Fd
compare/c	Iv	graduate/b	Iv	type/a	Ip
debut/vi/vt	Fs	headquarter/vi	Fb	unique	Dw
disinterested	Dc	infer	Dc	various	Fs
each/a	Gs	most/a/w	Dc	who/b/w	Gp
either	Gs				

Decile 2 (10-19%)

Number of Approval Votes = 44

ain't/a/s	Gv	farther/c	Dc	medium/b	Gn
author	Fs	finalize	Fd	mighty/w	Dx
bimonthly	Dc	fortuitous	Dc	nauseous	Dc
bit	Dx	good/b/w	Ga	only/b	Fs
commentate/vi	Fb	head	Iv	outside	Ip
different/a	Im	headquarter/vt	Fb	premiere	Fs
different/b	Im	host	Fs	quick	Ga
drunk	Gs	kind/a	Ga	quote	Fs
due	Dc	medium/a/s/w	Gn	rarely/w	Dr

regard	Dc	unexceptional	Dc	who/a/w	Gp
ring	Gv	upward	Im	who/c/w	Gp
saving	Gn	very/b	Gs	who/c/s	Gp
some	Dc	very/c	Gs	-wise	Fd
someplace	Dc	were/c	Gv	Xmas	S
someway	Dc				

Decile 3 (20-29%)

Number of Approval Votes = 35

ain't/c	Gv	ever	Dc	prove	Gv
alibi/b	Fs	farther/a	Dc	rate/a	Dx
anxious/w	Dx	fewer/a	Gs	spl.inf./a	Gs
bad/a/w	Ga	follow	Gs	stomp	Dc
bad/c/s	Ga	good/a/s	Ga	tend	Dc
can/b/w	Dc	good/b/s	Ga	too	Im
compare/a	Iv	kind/b	Gs	try/a	Im
cope	Iv	like/b	Gs	upcoming	Dx
dilemma	Dx	me/w	Gp	very/d	Gs
enthuse/a	Fb	noun/l	Gs	were/a	Gv
enthuse/b	Fb	OK/c	Fs	were/b	Gv
escape	Iv	OK/d	Fs		

Decile 4 (30-39%)

Number of Approval Votes = 42

above/b	Fs	consensus	Dr	provided	Im
all	Im	consequential	Dx	rarely/s	Dr
any	Gs	contact/a	Dx	rate/b	Dx
anyone	Gs	equal/b	Dr	reverend/b	Im
bad/a/s	Ga	farther/b	Dc	sometime	Dx
bad/b/w	Ga	fewer/b	Gs	though	Gs
better	Dx	fewer/c	Gs	transpire	Dx
but/b	Gs	hang/a	Gv	were/d	Gv
buy	Fs	hang/b	Gv	whence	Dr
can/a	Dc	individual/c	Dx	while/c	Dx
center	Iv	latter	Dx	why	Dr
cohort	Dx	likely	Im	win	Fs
compare/b	Iv	loan	Dc	wish	Dc
comprise/a	Dc	materialize	Dx	zoom/b	Dx

Decile 5 (40-49%)

Number of Approval Votes = 33

about	Im	but/a	Gp	first/a	Gs
alibi/a	Dx	can/b/s	Dc	first/b	Gs
appreciate	Dx	comprise/b	Dc	help	Gs
back/a	Ip	different/c	Im	hopefully	Dx
behalf	Ip	dive	Gv	individual	Dx
burgeon	Dx	doubt/a	Im	lack	Iv
bus/a	Fs	doubt/b	Im	most/a/s	Dc

normalcy	Fd
O.K./b	Fs
one/b	Gs
personality	Dx
practically/b	Dx
presently/b	Dx
quiz/b	Dx
raise/b	Dc
reverend/a	Im
sen. citizen	Da
so/a	Im
spl. inf./b	Gs

Decile 6 (50-59%)

Number of Approval Votes = 37

agenda/b	Gn
alternative	Dx
as . . . as	Gs
back/b	Ip
bad/b/s	Gs
balance	Dx
balding	Da
boast	Dx
bus/b	Sp
celebrant	Dx
data	Gn
deprecate	Dc
done	Dx
each other/a	Dx
each other/b	Dx
epithet	Dx
fault	Fs
identify/b	Im
important	Ga
individual/a	Dx
insignia/b	Gn
intrigue	Dx
mighty/s	Dx
noun/2	Gs
oblivious/b	Ip
O.K./a	Fs
practically/a	Dx
quiz/a	Dx
seem	Im
sick/a	Ip
spl. inf./c	Gs
straddle/b	Dx
sustain	Dx
that	Gs
try/b	Fs
while/b	Dx
who/b/s	Gp

Decile 7 (60-69%)

Number of Approval Votes = 39

ain't/c/s	Gv
anticipate	Dx
anxious/s	Dx
bug/w	Dx
cannot	Gs
careen	Dc
claim	Dx
complete	Dn
contact/b	Dx
develop	Dx
each/b	Gs
flammable	Dc
gambit	Gx
idle	Dx
ilk	Dx
leave/a	Dc
me/s	Gp
nicely	Dx
none	Gs
noun/3	Gs
over	Dx
overly	Fd
predicate	Dx
proportion	Dx
quite/c	Dx
quite/d	Dx
rendition	Dx
replica	Dx
rile	Da
shakedown/b	Dx
shall	Gv
spl. inf./d	Gs
spoof/b	Dx
stall/b	Dx
tribute	Dx
type/b	Dx
while/a	Dx
who/a/s	Gp
zoom/a	Dx

Decile 8 (70-79%)

Number of Approval Votes = 34

above/a	Fs
advise	Dx
between/a	Dx
can/d	Dc
compensate	Dx
condition	Dx
definite	Dx
dbl. neg.	Gs
equal/a	Dw
escalate	Fb
foremost	Dx
gauntlet	Dc
graduate/a	Iv
human	Fs
insignia/a	Gn
interpretative	Dc
kind/c	Gs
like/a	Gs
oblivious/a	Dx
presently/a	Dx
renege	Dx
responsible	Dx
should/b	Gv
spark	Dx
spell	Dx
spiral	Dx
stall/a	Dx

this	Dc
through	Dx
trek	Dx
trigger	Dx
viewpoint	Da
which	Gs
whose	Gp

Decile 9 (80-89%)

Number of Approval Votes = 30

agenda/a	Gn
badly	Dx
bid	Dx
blame	Iv
bug/s	Ds
can/c	Dc
certain	Dw
discomfit	Dc
dope/a	Dx
leave/b	Dc
most/b/w	Dc
mutual/a	Dc
mutual/b	Dc
noun/4	Gs
quite/a	Dx
quite/b	Dx
raise/a	Dc
rambunctious	Da
rattle	Dx
scan	Dx
shakedown/a	Dx
shambles	Dx
should/a	Gv
sick/b	Dx
so/b	Im
sound	Dx
spoof/a	Dx
straddle/a	Dx
truculent	Dx
very/a	Gs

Decile 10 (90-100%)

Number of Approval Votes = 8

dope/b	Dx
dropout	Dx
groom	Dx
hectic	Dx
identify/a	Dx
internecine	Dx
most/b/s	Dx
raise/c	Dc

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dictionaries

The American College Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1953.

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New York: American Heritage Publishing Company, Inc., and Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1971.

Dictionary of American Slang. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1960.

Funk and Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary: Text Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

The Oxford English Dictionary. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

The Random House College Dictionary. New York: Random House, Inc., 1972.

The Random House Dictionary of the English Language: The Unabridged Edition. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. 8th ed. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1973.

Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language: Second Edition: Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1959.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language: College Edition. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1959.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language: Second College Edition. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1972.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1963.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language: Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1966.

Usage Guides and Studies

Baker, Sheridan. The Complete Stylist. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1966.

Bernstein, Theodore M. The Careful Writer. New York: Atheneum, 1965.

____________. Miss Thistlebottom's Hobgoblins. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1971.

____________. Watch Your Language. Manhassett, N. Y.: Channel Press, 1958.

Bryant, Margaret M. Current American Usage. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., Inc., 1962.

Copperud, Roy H. American Usage: The Consensus. New York: Van Nostrand Publishing Co., 1970.

____________. A Dictionary of Usage and Style. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1964.

____________. Words on Paper. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1960.

Crisp, Raymond D. "Changes in Attitudes Toward English Usage." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971.

Evans, Bergen and Cornelia. A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage. New York: Random House, 1957.

Flesch, Rudolf. The ABC of Style. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Follett, Wilson. Modern American Usage: A Guide. Edited and Compiled by Jacques Barzun in collaboration with Carlos Baker, Frederick W. Dupee, Dudley Fitts, James D. Hart, Phyllis McGinley, and Lionel Trilling. New York: Hill and Wang, 1966.

Fowler, Henry W. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

____________. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. 2d ed. Revised by Sir Ernest Gowers. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Fries, Charles Carpenter. American English Grammar. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1940.

Hall, J. Lesslie. English Usage: Studies in the History and Uses of English Words and Phrases. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1917.

Krapp, George P. A Comprehensive Guide to Good English. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1927.

Leonard, Sterling Andrus Current English Usage. English Monograph No. I, National Council of Teachers of English. Chicago: National Council of Teachers of English, 1932.

Marckwardt, Albert H. and Walcott, Fred. Facts About Current English Usage. English Monograph No. 7, National Council of Teachers of English. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1938.

Nicholson, Margaret. A Dictionary of American English Usage. Based on H. W. Fowler, A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Perrin, Porter G. Writer's Guide and Index to English. 5th ed. Revised by Wilma R. Ebbitt. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1972.

White, Richard Grant. Words and Their Uses. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1899.

Works Consulted

Allen, Harold B., ed. Readings in Applied English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958.

____________. Readings in Applied English Linguistics. 2d ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1964.

____________. "Samuel Johnson and the Authoritarian Tradition in Linguistic Criticism." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1940.

Baker, Sheridan. "The Sociology of Dictionaries and the Sociology of Words." In New Aspects of Lexicography. Edited by Howard D. Weinbrot. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972. Pp. 138-151.

Barnhart, Clarence L. "Problems in Editing Commercial Dictionaries." In Readings in Applied English Linguistics. 2d ed. Edited by Harold B. Allen. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1964. Pp. 457-475.

Barzun, Jacques. "What is a Dictionary?" American Scholar 32 (1963): 176-181.

Bishop, Morris. "Good Usage, Bad Usage, and Usage." In The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc. and Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971. Pp. xxi-xxiv.

Card, William; McDavid, Virginia; and McDavid, Raven I., Jr. "Dimensions of Usage and Dictionary Labeling." Forthcoming.

Cassidy, Frederic G. "Restrictive Labels." In Funk and Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary: Text Edition. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, Inc., 1963. Pp. xxiii-xxiv.

Dobbins, Austin C. "The Language of the Cultivated." College English 18 (October 1956) : 46-47.

Fisk, Ernest F. Student's Guide. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969.

Follett, Wilson. "Sabotage in Springfield." The Atlantic, January 1962, pp. 73-77.

Fries, Charles Carpenter. "Usage Levels and Dialect Distribution." In The American College Dictionary. New York: Random House, Inc., 1953. Pp. xxvii-xxviii.

Gove, Philip B. "English Dictionaries of the Future." In New Aspects of Lexicography. Edited by Howard D. Weinbrot. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972. Pp. 151-168.

____________. "Linguistic Advances and Lexicography." Word Study 36 (October 1961) : 3-8.

____________. "Usage in the Dictionary." College English 37 (December 1966) : 285-292.

____________., ed. The Role of the Dictionary. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1967.

Hall, Robert A., Jr. "Telling the Truth." Quarterly Journal of Speech (December 1962) : pp. 434-435.

Hartung, Charles V. "Doctrines of English Usage." English Journal 45 (December 1956) : 517-525.

Hill, Archibald A. "Laymen, Lexicographers, and Linguists." Language 46 (June 1970) : 245-258.

Householder, Fred W. and Saporta, Sol, eds. Problems in Lexicography. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1962.

Joos, Martin. "The Isolation of Styles." In Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 12. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1959. Pp. 107-113.

Kenyon, John S. "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English." College English 10 (October 1948) : 31-36.

Kilburn, Patrick. "The Gentlemen's Guide to Linguistic Etiquette." Union College Symposium 9 (Spring 1970) : 2-6.

____________. "Labeling the Language." Word Study 44 (October 1968) : 1-7.

Krapp, George P. The English Language in America. 2 vols. New York: The Century Company for the Modern Language Association of America, 1925.

Kučera, Henry. "Computers in Language Analysis and in Lexicography." In The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., and Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971. Pp. xxxvii-xl.

Kučera, Henry and Francis, W. Nelson. Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English. Providence, R. I.: Brown University Press, 1967.

Laughlin, Rosemary M. "Prescriptivism, Psychology and THAT Dictionary." In Studies in Linguistics in Honor of Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Edited by Lawrence M. Davis. University, Ala.: The University of Alabama Press, 1972. Pp. 377-396.

Leonard, Sterling Andrus. The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage 1700-1800. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature No. 25. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1929.

Lynes, Russell. "Usage, Precise and Otherwise." Harper's Magazine, April 1970, pp. 32-36.

Marckwardt, Albert H. "Dictionaries and the English Language." English Journal 52 (May 1963) : 336-345.

___________. "The Dictionary as a Teaching Resource." TESOL Quarterly 7 (December 1973) : 369-379.

___________. "Lexicographical Method and the Usage Survey." Forthcoming.

___________. "Questions of Usage in Dictionaries." In Lexicography in English. Edited by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. and Audrey R. Duckert. Vol. 211 of Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1973. Pp. 172-178.

McDavid, Raven I., Jr. "Dialect Labels in the Merriam Third." PADS 47 (April 1967) : pp. 1-22.

___________. "Dictionary Makers and Their Problems." In Language and Teaching: Essays in Honor of W. Wilbur Hatfield. Edited by Virginia Glenn McDavid. Chicago: Chicago State College, 1969. Pp. 70-79.

___________. "The English Language in the United States." In Current Trends in Linguistics. Vol. 10. Linguistics in North America. Edited by Thomas Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1973. Pp. 1-39.

___________. "False Scents and Cold Trails: The Pre-publication Criticism of the Merriam Third." Journal of English Linguistics 5 (March 1971) : 101-121.

___________. "A Review of the Reviews of Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language: Unabridged." Unpublished report prepared for Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., 1966.

___________. "Usage, Dialects, and Functional Varieties." In The Random House Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971. Pp. xxi-xxii.

McDavid, Raven I., Jr. and Duckert, Audrey R., eds. Lexicography in English. Vol. 211 of Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, May 1973.

McDavid, Virginia G. "Variations in Dictionary Labeling Practices." In Lexicography in English. Edited by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. and Audrey R. Duckert. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1973. Pp. 187-207.

McKnight, George H. Modern English in the Making. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.

McMillan, James B. "Dictionaries and Usage." Word Study 39 (February 1964) : 1-4.

Mencken, H. L. The American Language. Abridged edition. Edited by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. with the assistance of David W. Maurer. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Meyers, Walter E. "A Study of Usage Items Based on an Examination of the Brown Corpus." CCC 23 (May 1972) : 155-169.

Monson, Samuel C. "Restrictive Labels—Descriptive or Prescriptive?" In Lexicography in English. Edited by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. and Audrey R. Duckert. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1973. Pp. 208-212.

Morris, William. "The Making of a Dictionary." CCC 20 (December 1969) : 198-203.

A New Guide to Dictionary Use. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1967. Pamphlet.

Read, Allen Walker. "Approaches to Lexicography and Semantics." In Current Trends in Linguistics. Vol. 10: Linguistics in North America. Edited by Thomas Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1973. Pp. 145-205.

____________. "Is American English Deteriorating?" Word Study 41 (October 1965) : 1-3.

____________. "That Dictionary or The Dictionary?" Consumer Reports 28 (October 1963) : 488-492.

____________. "Desk Dictionaries." Consumer Reports 28 (November 1963) : 547-550.

Roberts, Paul. "Pronominal This: A Quantitative Analysis." American Speech 27 (October 1952) : 170-178.

Sledd, James. "Dollars and Dictionaries: The Limits of Commercial Lexicography." In New Aspects of Lexicography. Edited by Howard D. Weinbrot. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972. Pp. 119-137.

Sledd, James and Ebbitt, Wilma R., eds. Dictionaries and THAT Dictionary. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1962.

Sledd, James and Kolb, Gwin J. Doctor Johnson's Dictionary: Essays in The Biography of a Book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Stafford, Jean. "Plight of the American Language." Saturday Review World, December 4, 1973, pp. 14-18.

Vonnegut, Kurt, Jr. "The Latest Word." In The Role of the Dictionary. Edited by Philip B. Gove. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967. Pp. 58-60. Reprinted from the New York Times Book Review (October 30, 1966), pp. 1, 56.

Weinbrot, Howard D., ed. New Aspects of Lexicography: Literary Criticism, Intellectual History, and Social Change. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972.

Wells, Ronald A. Dictionaries and the Authoritarian Tradition: A Study in English Usage and Lexicography. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1973.

Wolk, Anthony. "Linguistic and Social Bias in the American Heritage Dictionary." College English 33 (May 1972): 930-935.

Woolf, Henry B. "Dear Mr. Webster: The Letters Dictionary Users Write." CCC 23 (October 1972): 283-288.

Zgusta, Ladislav. Manual of Lexicography. Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, 1971.

NOTES

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

[1] *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926), p. 110, quoted in James H. Sledd and Gwin J. Kolb, *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary: Essays in the Biography of a Book* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 6.

[2] "What is a Dictionary?" *American Scholar* 32 (1963): 176-181.

[3] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12 November 1973, p. 12.

[4] (New York: Antheneum, 1965).

[5] *Saturday Review World*, 4 December 1973, pp. 14-18.

[6] Harold B. Allen, "Samuel Johnson and the Authoritarian Tradition in Linguistic Criticism" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1940), pp. 169ff., and passim.

[7] *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary*, p. 37.

[8] 1969. Hereafter referred to as AHD.

[9] 1961. Hereafter referred to as W3.

[10] *College English* 18 (October 1956): 46-47.

[11] 1953. Hereafter referred to as ACD.

[12] 1953. Hereafter referred to as WNCD.

[13] Dobbins, p. 47.

[14] In Raven I. McDavid, Jr. and Audrey R. Duckert, eds., *Lexicography in English*, vol. 211 of the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences (New York: New York Academy of Scienc[illegible]973), pp. 187-207.

[15] The dictionaries are *The American H[illegible]age Dictionary of the English Language*, 1969 (AHD); *The Random House College Dictionary*, 1967 (RHCD); *The Standard College Dictionary*, 1963 (SCD); *Webster's New World Dictionary of the English Language*, Second College Edition, 1970 (NWD2); and *Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*, 1963 (WC7). The two scholarly studies are Sterling Andrus Leonard, *Current English Usage* (Chicago: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1932) and Raymond D. Crisp, "Changes in Attitudes Toward English Usage" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971).

[16] *Journal of English Linguistics* 5 (March 1971): 101-122.

[17] "A Review of the Reviews of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language: Unabridged*," unpublished paper prepared for Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., May 1966.

[18] (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1962).

[19] "The English Language in the United States," in Thomas Sebeok, ed., *Linguistics in North America*, vol. 10 of *Current Trends in Linguistics* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1973), p. 29.

[20] Ibid., p. 30.

[21] "Introduction," AHD, p. vi.

[22] Morris Bishop, "Good Usage, Bad Usage, and Usage," AHD, p. xxi.

[23] The sources of this and all other usage notes referred to or quoted are indicated in the text. As entries are alphabetized in the sources, no page number is provided.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

[1] "The Making of a Dictionary," *CCC* 20 (December 1969): 197.

[2] P. vi.

[3] P. vii.

[4] Campbell's position is analyzed in detail in George H. McKnight, *Modern English in the Making* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), pp. 406ff.

[5] P. xxi.

[6] P. xxiii.

[7] "Usage Panel," pp. x-xii.

[8] "Gentlemen's Guide to Linguistic Etiquette," *Union College Symposium* 9 (Spring 1970): 5.

[9] To name a few, J. Donald Adams, Sheridan Baker, Theodore Bernstein, Roy Copperud, Sydney Harris, Dwight Macdonald, Mario Pei.

[10] Some of the reviews have been collected in Sledd and Ebbitt. Four Usage Panel members are affiliated with *Saturday Review*, six with *The New York Times*, nine with *The New Yorker*. Others on the Panel are frequent or occasional contributors to some or all of the magazines and newspapers listed.

[11] P. vii.

[12] Letter of 15 October 1970 to Virginia G. McDavid.

[13] Sheridan Baker, "The Sociology of Dictionaries and the Sociology of Words," in Harold D. Weinbrot, ed., *New Aspects of Lexicography* (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972), pp. 146-147.

[14] Russell Lynes, "Usage, Precise and Otherwise," *Harper's Magazine*, June 1970, p. 36.

[15] Ernest F. Fiske, *Student's Guide: The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969), p. 23.

[16] Albert H. Marckwardt, "Questions of Usage in Dictionaries," in McDavid and Duckert, eds., *Lexicography in English*, p. 176, and "Lexicographical Method and the Usage Survey," forthcoming, p. 140.

[17] This is one of only two instances in which a unanimous vote of the Panel is reported. The other item suffering unanimous disapproval is the adverbial use of *good* in writing in sentences such as "The watch runs good." Apparently, Morris Bishop, the author of the essay on usage in AHD, was not aware of this unanimous vote, as he says, "in only one case did they agree 100 per cent—in disfavor of *simultaneous* as an adverb . . ." (p. xxiv). It is interesting that both these unanimous votes concern the adverbial use of forms generally considered adjectives.

[18] The notes added in the 1971 edition are in the entries *about* and *already;* those added in the 1973 edition are in the entries *collide, cosmetic, crunch,* and *noisome*. It cannot be determined whether the "new" notes represent newly collected Panel opinions for the editions in question or whether they were collected in the original series of questionnaires. In at least one case,

it appears that the note was already on hand. Marckwardt, in "Lexicographical Method and the Usage Survey," p. 140, says, "We know that the questionnaire included the expression *not about to* [this is the expression dealt with in the usage note under the entry *about*] but there is no usage note on it." His statement implies that the item was questioned before the publication of the 1969 edition of AHD, to which Marckwardt was obviously referring. The note under *about* did not appear until the 1971 edition.

[19] "The Making of a Dictionary," p. 199.

[20] P. xxiv.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Lexicographical Method," p. 143.

[23] P. xlix.

[24] "Questions of Usage," p. 177.

[25] There is a minor fourth category consisting of at least two votes on usages which are either explicitly or implicitly presented as "approved" rather than as "questioned" by the editors. See the usage notes on *mutual* and *double negative*. The note on *leave* contains two votes, one of which, the vote on the pattern "Left alone, he was quite productive" (81 percent approval) probably belongs in this class. These votes, although not votes of approval of a *questioned* usage, have been included in the total of approval votes in this discussion.

[26] "Lexicographical Method," p. 144.

[27] *Current English Usage*.

[28] Ibid., p. 99.

[29] "Changes in Attitudes Toward English Usage."

[30] *Facts About Current English Usage* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938).

[31] Ibid., p. 19.

[32] Ibid., pp. 50, 51.

[33] "Lexicographical Method," p. 140.

[34] Ibid., p. 145.

[35] Kilburn, "Gentlemen's Guide," pp. 4, 5.

[36] "Laymen, Lexicographers, and Linguists," *Language* 46 (June 1970): 245-258.

[37] Allen Walker Read, "Approaches to Lexicography and Semantics," in Sebeok, ed., *Linguistics in North America*, p. 165.

[38] P. xxiii.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

[1] Actually, analysis of treatment was conducted in ten dictionaries, but one, the *American College Dictionary*, has not been included in the results reported here for two reasons: (1) it has been supplanted by the *Random House Dictionary* and the *Random House College Dictionary*; (2) its handling of usage matters is quite similar to that of several other dictionaries, and addition of *American College Dictionary* data only further confirms the findings presented.

[2] "Preface," p. vi.
[3] P. xi.
[4] "Preface," p. 6a.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.
[7] *A New Guide to Dictionary Use* (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1967), p. 7.
[8] 1960.
[9] P. xxix.
[10] P. vi.
[11] P. xix.
[12] P. viii.
[13] Pp. xxv, xxvi.
[14] P. xxvi.
[15] Pp. xxiii, xxiv.
[16] P. xxv.
[17] In McDavid and Duckert, eds., *Lexicography in English*, pp. 187-207.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

[1] Appendix 1.
[2] (London: Oxford University Press, 1926). Second edition, revised by Sir Ernest Gowers (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).
[3] (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1970).
[4] Pp. ix, x.
[5] Pp. xi, xii.
[6] (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1929).
[7] P. 95.
[8] See above, p. 49.
[9] *Facts About Current English Usage.*
[10] *English Usage: Studies in the History and Uses of English Words and Phrases* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1917).
[11] See above, p. 48.
[12] See above, Table 11, p. 47.
[13] Brief excerpts from their reviews are quoted on the back cover of the wrapper for Nicholson.
[14] P. v.
[15] Ibid.
[16] "Preface," p. vii.
[17] P. viii.
[18] Pp. xix-xxiv.
[19] P. xix.
[20] (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1960).
[21] See above, p. 88.
[22] P. 11.
[23] (Manhassett, N. Y.: Channel Press, 1958).
[24] (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1971).
[25] Pp. vii-xviii.
[26] P. viii.

[27] P. viii. The italics have been added.
[28] January 1962, pp. 73-77.
[29] Pp. 1-30.
[30] P. 1.
[31] P. 3.
[32] P. 4.
[33] P. 3.
[34] P. 7.
[35] P. 30.
[36] P. 25.
[37] P. 64.
[38] Pp. 107-111.
[39] Pp. 1-454.
[40] Pp. 457-752.
[41] Pp. 1-29.
[42] P. ix.
[43] (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

[1] See above, pp. 71, 107.
[2] Pp. 103-113.
[3] *Words and Their Uses* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1899), p. 14.
[4] Follett, p. 30.
[5] Bernstein, p. viii.
[6] "The Sociology of Dictionaries and the Sociology of Words," p. 151.
[7] P. 145.
[8] Pp. 137, 138.
[9] "The Latest Word," *New York Times Book Review* (30 October 1966): pp. 1, 56. Reprinted in Philip B. Gove, ed., *The Role of the Dictionary* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967), p. 60.
[10] "Is American English Deteriorating?" *Word Study* 41 (October 1965).
[11] "Telling the Truth," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (December 1962), pp. 434-435. Reprinted in Gove, *The Role of the Dictionary*, pp. 26, 27.
[12] P. 168.
[13] "Approaches," p. 165.
[14] Pp. 23, 25.
[15] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1940).
[16] Pp. 26-38.
[17] *American Speech* 27 (October 1952): 170-178. Reprinted in Harold B. Allen, ed., *Readings in Applied Linguistics* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958), pp. 267-275.
[18] P. 270.
[19] P. 275.
[20] Henry Kučera and W. Nelson Francis, *Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1967).
[21] P. xxxix.
[22] "The Making of a Dictionary," pp. 201-202.
[23] *CCC* 23 (May 1972): 155-169.

[24] P. 156.

[25] Sheridan Baker, *The Complete Stylist* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1966).

[26] Meyers, pp. 163, 164.

(Continued from inside front cover)

(EXECUTIVE COUNCIL)

The officers and **Lee A. Pederson**, *Emory University* (term expires December 1974); **Juanita V. Williamson**, *LeMoyne-Owen College* (term expires December 1975); **Daniel Cardenas**, *California State University at Long Beach* (term expires December 1976); **Gary N. Underwood**, *University of Texas* (term expires December 1977); **Mary Richie Key**, *University of California at Irvine* (term expires December 1978).

CHAIRMEN OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEES

REGIONALISMS AND LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY: **William R. Van Riper**, *Louisiana State University*
PLACE NAMES: **E. C. Ehrensperger**, *Yankton College*
USAGE:
NON-ENGLISH DIALECTS:
NEW WORDS: **I. Willis Russell**, *University of Alabama*
PROVERBIAL SAYINGS: **Margaret M. Bryant**, *Brooklyn College of the City University of New York*

REGIONAL SECRETARIES

NEW ENGLAND: **Audrey R. Duckert**, *University of Massachusetts*
MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES:
SOUTH ATLANTIC STATES: **Woodford A. Heflin**, *Air University*
SOUTH CENTRAL STATES: **Gary N. Underwood**, *University of Texas*
SOUTHWEST:
MIDDLE WEST: **Glenn Gilbert**, *Southern Illinois University*
ROCKY MOUNTAINS: **John E. McKendrick**, *Brigham Young University*
PACIFIC COAST: **William Matthews**, *University of California at Los Angeles*
CANADA: **Walter S. Avis**, *Royal Military College*
CUSTODIAN OF COLLECTIONS: **Frederic G. Cassidy**, *University of Wisconsin*